

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, May 9, 2013

PARTICIPANTS:

Members:

KEITH RIZZARDI, Chair
Assistant Professor, St. Thomas University
School of Law

EDWARD (TED) AMES
Senior Advisor, Penobscot East
Resource

JULIE BONNEY
Executive Director, Alaska
Groundfish Data Bank, Inc.

RICHEN (DICK) M. BRAME
Atlantic States Fisheries Director
Coastal Conservation Association

COLUMBUS H. BROWN
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Retired

PAUL CLAMPITT
Owner, F/V Augustine

JOHN S. CORBIN
President, Aquaculture Planning and
Advocacy

PATRICIA DOERR
Director of Coastal and Marine
Programs,
New Jersey Chapter, The Nature
Conservancy

PHILLIP J. DYSKOW
Yamaha Marine Group, Retired

MICHELE LONGO EDER
Attorney and Owner

KEN FRANKE
Sportfishing Association of
California

PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

ELIZABETH (LIZ) HAMILTON
Executive Director, Northwest
Sportfishing Industry Association

JULIE MORRIS
Assistant Vice President for
Academic Affairs, New College of
Florida

GEORGE NARDI
Hatchery Manager Sablefish Canada, Inc.

ROBERT RHEAULT
Executive Director, East Coast
Shellfish Growers Association

VA'AMUA HENRY SESEPASARA
Representative, House of
Representatives
American Samoa Legislature

DAVID C. WALLACE
Owner, Wallace & Associates

PAMELA YOCHEM
Senior Research Scientist and
Executive Vice President Hubbs-Sea
World Research Institute

Designated Federal Officer:

MARK HOLLIDAY
Director, Office of Policy NOAA
Fisheries
Office of the Assistant Administrator

Consultants:

BOB BEAL
Executive Director Atlantic States
Marine Fisheries Commission

PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

DAVID DONALDSON
Executive Director (Acting) Gulf
States Marine Fisheries Commission

RANDY FISHER
Executive Director Pacific States
Marine Fisheries Commission

NOAA Staff:

MS. BRYANT

MR. DOREMUS

MS. FERRO

MR. HANSEN

MS. LOVETT

MS. NAUGHTEN

MR. RAUCH

MR. SCHNEIDER

MR. SCHWABB

MR. STOLL

MS. THOMPSON

Other Participants:

MS. AVERILL

MS. COUGHLIN

MR. FLOURNOY

MR. KAELYN

MR. KELLY

MR. LASSEN

PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D) :

MR. LUGAR

MR. MARKS

MS. METCALF

MR. PARKES

MR. RIUTTA

MS. SEMON

MR. SEVERANCE

MS. TRUMBLE

MS. THOMPSON

MR. WHITESIDE

* * * * *

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
Welcome and Introductions	7
Opening Remarks	11
Managing Our Nation's Fisheries 3 (MNF3)	16
Agenda Set-up for Friday:	
Priorities for Discussion	17
Discussion Leaders	18
Trigger Questions	23
Seafood Certification Work Group	27
Panel Presentation by External Experts:	32
Marine Stewardship Council	32
Best Aquaculture Practices	49
Systems Assessment of Federal/State Fishery Management Programs	63
FishWatch Marketing and Partnerships	75
MAFAC/Panel Discussion	99
Certification Working Group Deliberation	131
Work Plan Next Steps	

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

(1:08 p.m.)

Welcome and Introductions

MR. RIZZARDI: Good afternoon, everybody. I'd like to get the meeting called to order.

That was quick. Hi, everybody. I'm Keith Rizzardi, and I'd like to welcome you to the meeting of the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee. Thank you to all the guests who are here to listen to our deliberations.

We spent the last few days on some very high-level discussions of some important fisheries issues, and we will be briefly discussing today what we did over the last few days, but we'll be elaborating on that in greater detail tomorrow.

As we open this meeting, I want to start off with some thank-yous, and the first and biggest one I want to give is to NOAA. I think everybody in this room owes a very significant debt of gratitude to NOAA, because not only was this a well-organized event, but our presence here reflects the agency's commitment to the Federal Advisory Committee process and to the stakeholders. You know, the government is in some very tight budgetary times, and as you all know we were waiting till the last minute for the approval for us to be here, and we're here, and I think that speaks really highly of what NOAA has invested in us and gives you a sense of how

1 important we are. And I hope we will live up to those
2 expectations over the next couple of days.

3 I also want to thank John Corbin for making his
4 first MAFAC meeting, our new appointee who's filling Randy
5 Cates' shoes. He comes with a similar perspective on Hawaii
6 and aquaculture, and I'm sure he'll be a very quick
7 contributor.

8 And I'd also like to give special thanks to three
9 current MAFAC members Julie Morris, George Nardi, and Bob
10 Rheault because all of them really stepped up over the last
11 few months and will be in a significant leadership role in the
12 discussions over the next two days talking about the items
13 that are on our agenda.

14 So, with that opening what I'd like to do is go
15 around and for those of us who haven't yet met each other and
16 especially for John's benefit go around the table and have
17 people say hello. And again I'm Keith Rizzardi, and I'm the
18 chairman, and we'll start over in the back.

19 MS. COUGHLIN: I'm a guest. Okay, how's that? Can
20 everyone hear me?

21 I'm Kerry Coughlin, and I'm the regional director
22 for the Marine Stewardship Council for the Americas, which is
23 North America/Latin America/the Russian Far East, and I sit on
24 our senior management team for the program globally. So,

1 thank you for including me in the meeting, Mr. Chairman. And
2 Eric, Sam, Mark good to see you all.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. LASSEN: Good afternoon. I'm Thor Lassen,
5 president of Ocean Trust. We've been writing for about 20some
6 years. I'm not sure when I started, but I also thank you for
7 including us in the agenda.

8 MS. METCALF: Molly Metcalf with the Global
9 Aquaculture Alliance, also a guest today. So, thank you for
10 the invitation. I was called in last minute to fill in for
11 someone who's supposed to be sitting here, so I'm happy to be
12 with all of you today.

13 MR. CORBIN: I'm John Corbin. Hi to everybody on
14 the Committee.

15 MR. DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, interim executive
16 director for the Gulf States Spring Fisheries Commission.

17 MS. MORRIS: I'm Julie Morris. I'm a MAFAC member
18 from Florida.

19 MR. RIZZARDI: Thanks, Julie.

20 MR. BEAL: I'M Bob Beal, executive director of the
21 Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. This is my first
22 MAFAC meeting, so bear with me.

1 MS. HAMILTON: Good afternoon, I'm Liz Hamilton,
2 executive director, Northwest Sportfishing Industry
3 Association.

4 MR. DYSKOW: And I'm Phil Dyskow, and I'm also a
5 MAFAC member from Florida.

6 MR. FRANKE: Ken Franke from San Diego Sportfishing
7 Association of California.

8 MS. YOCHER: Pam Yocher, MAFAC member from
9 California.

10 MS. BONNEY: Julie Bonney, MAFAC member from Alaska.

11 MR. DOREMUS: Paul Doremus, deputy assistant
12 administrator for operations for NOAA Fisheries.

13 MR. SCHWABB: Eric Schwabb, acting in the role of
14 the assistant secretary for conservation and management at
15 NOAA; also a MAFAC alumnus. (Laughter)

16 MR. RAUCH: Sam Rauch, acting head of the Fishing
17 Service.

18 MR. HOLLIDAY: Mark Holliday, Office of Policy for
19 NOAA Fisheries. I'm also a professional meeting organizer in
20 my spare time. (Laughter)

21 MR. WALLACE: Dave Wallace, MAFAC member from
22 Maryland.

23 MR. AMES: Ted Ames, MAFAC member at Pnobsco East
24 Resource Center.

1 MR. BROWN: Columbus Brown, MAFAC member, retired,
2 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

3 MR. SESEPASARA: I'm Henry Sesepasara from the
4 Territory of American Samoa, MAFAC member. In case you don't
5 where Samoa is, it's about 2600 miles south of Hawaii, south
6 of the equator.

7 MS. EDER: Michelle Longo Eder, MAFAC member from
8 Oregon.

9 MS. DOERR: Patty Doerr, MAFAC member with the New
10 Jersey chapter of the Nature Conservancy.

11 MR. CLAMPITT: I am Paul Clampitt. I'm a MAFAC
12 member from Washington State and a commercial long-line
13 fisherman.

14 MR. NARDI: George Nardi, a MAFAC member,
15 Aquiculture, from New Hampshire and, most recently, from the
16 Northwest.

17 MR. BRAME: I'm Dick Brame from North Carolina. I
18 work for the Coastal Conservation Association.

19 MS. THOMPSON: Jenny Thompson. I am part of the
20 Policy Office.

21 MS. LOVETT: Heidi Lovett, Office of Policy.

22 MS. BRYANT: Laurel Bryant with the Office of
23 Communications at NOAA Fisheries doing external affairs.

1 MR. RIZZARDI: Thank you, everybody, for the
2 introductions. You've already heard that both Sam and Eric
3 are here in their leadership roles within NOAA. And I don't
4 want to have them sit around and be part of the entire
5 deliberations, but I do want to give them the opportunity to
6 address us.

7 So, we'd love to hear from you.

8 **Opening Remarks**

9 MR. RAUCH: Thank you, Keith. This is somewhat of
10 an exhausting week for me.

11 For those of you who didn't hear my very profound
12 words earlier, I think that we have been involved this week
13 in, as Keith said, a long-term, high-level discussion about
14 what direction to take U.S. Fisheries, and it ranges from a
15 series of best practices or change practices that we can do
16 now to some policy changes, which may be relatively easy to;
17 do to some regulatory changes, which would be somewhat harder
18 to do; to some legislative changes, which will be very hard to
19 do even if they're good ideas. And we need to look at that
20 and figure out amongst all those recommendations which ones
21 are good, which ones can be done, how they can be done some
22 of them are conflicting, so we'll have to figure out a way
23 through those and a path forward all at a time when there are

1 budget and other realities that are going to limit some of the
2 things that we want to do but just can't.

3 So, I think that's the challenge for us. We in
4 particular wanted you here because you provide us an
5 opportunity to help synthesize some of that. We do want to
6 hear what your thoughts are, taking that mass of information
7 that you just heard, that I just heard, and narrowing it down
8 to something useful and pointed and directed. I think that is
9 the role, and that is what we want from you.

10 We also want your input on these other topics. For
11 those of you who participated, you know that the certification
12 issue came up repeatedly. It came up from the councils, it
13 came up in a number of sessions, and it is something you have
14 been working on. And I have been anxiously awaiting your
15 conclusions on that, because I think that will help guide us
16 on a path forward.

17 And I also do not want to omit the other major topic
18 that you were working on with the councils. I note that the
19 Council Chairs meeting is going on downstairs they're going
20 to start again in just a few minutes and that one of the
21 collaborations between this group and the councils is trying
22 to help us work through ESA, what the role of the councils is
23 in that. That's something that I view this group as providing
24 a necessary facilitation and guidance role in that, because

1 sometimes between us and the councils we can lose our way and
2 we need some help.

3 And so I don't want to spend a lot of time. If you
4 have questions, I'll be happy to take some questions, but I do
5 want to give Eric a chance to say a few words.

6 Eric.

7 MR. SCHWABB: Well, thank you, Sam. Thanks,
8 everybody.

9 You know, I first wanted to say, as Keith noted, you
10 all experienced, as we did, the delays in getting approvals to
11 this meeting. This is a part of our lives today and certainly
12 seemingly for the foreseeable future. But all of the NOAA
13 people that attended the meeting got their approvals at the
14 same time that you did. We weren't coming without you. And I
15 say that in all seriousness. That's the importance that we
16 place on the role that each of you plays in giving us
17 important advice on the issues that are on your agenda and
18 others.

19 I won't repeat what Sam said other than to say that
20 in traveling around the halls over the last few days, I have
21 heard some pretty consistent feedback about some of the
22 specific things that you're engaged in, and this Endangered
23 Species Act issue did not come up often during the course of
24 the meeting, but it came up prominently the first morning.

1 And Julie, I did personally hear a lot of
2 appreciation for the work that you are already leading you
3 and the chairman and members of the workgroup. I know
4 engagement on this Working Waterfronts issue is very important
5 to us and, as Sam said, your efforts to synthesize some of
6 what we've heard with respect to fisheries management will be,
7 I think, uniquely important to us because of the breadth of
8 your geographic and issue-oriented representation. And of
9 course, again, I think just as you're about to embark upon the
10 importance of the expertise that you can bring in deliberating
11 around this certification issue and providing us some advice
12 is going to be very important.

13 For the newer members, I introduced myself as an
14 alumnus. I did serve on this committee for five years and
15 viewed that as a very important part of my experience in the
16 realm of fisheries and oceans management, so, for the newer
17 members, welcome; for the members that have been around a
18 little longer, thanks for hanging in, and we'll continue to
19 work very closely with you going forward.

20 MR. RIZZARDI: Sam and Eric, again I just want to
21 say thank you for making us part of the last couple of days
22 and for making sure the funding was there for this FACA
23 Committee, and I think all of us owe both of them a round of
24 applause. (Applause)

1 So, for the next piece of our agenda I'll be turning
2 this over to Mark to try to walk us through what we're going
3 to do the next day on Managing Fisheries 3, because there's
4 going to be work that's going to be done overnight that he's
5 going to have to do some planning for. So, we'll have a brief
6 segment on Managing Fisheries 3, and then we'll be turning to
7 the issue of sustainability certification.

8 But before I have Mark speak, I want to point out
9 something that happened at that final plenary session and some
10 of the words that were said.

11 Sam, in his remarks, pointed out that we need to
12 align the science and the data with the economic realities.
13 And then you had Dean from the legislative staff from the
14 House Natural Resources Group, and he said: The
15 recommendations that are coming out of these proceedings are
16 going to serve as a basis for determining our budgetary
17 decisions. And then you had Jeff from the Senate saying:
18 Well, I heard about better effort and better data and better
19 analysis, but all of that equates to dollar signs. So, the
20 theme you were hearing repeatedly from the folks who are in
21 the leadership that were speaking was what about the money?
22 What about the money? What about the money? And it's a
23 significant issue, and it is certainly something that is on
24 their minds on a regular basis for the leaders here at NOAA.

1 So, as we think about what to do with Managing
2 Fisheries 3, there were lots of good ideas, and some of them
3 are very expensive, and some of them are going to take a long
4 time. But I see an opportunity for our group and our, you
5 know, diverse group of stakeholders here and our expertise to
6 weigh in and to help sift through those proceedings and try to
7 identify some things that are value added: What things can be
8 done that will save us money in the near term; what
9 technologies can be implemented that can save us money; what
10 things are so important where the return on investment is so
11 high that they should be prioritized. And if we can find a
12 way as a body to reach some consensus on some of those points,
13 I think that would be a real contribution to NOAA Fisheries
14 work. So, with that preface, I'm going to turn it over to
15 Mark and let him walk us through the plan for managing
16 Fisheries.

17 **Managing Our Nation's Fisheries 3 (MNF3)**

18 **Agenda Set-up for Friday**

19 MR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you, Keith. I wanted to make
20 sure that we knew what we were going to cover in terms of the
21 agenda both today and tomorrow, so we do have a few minutes
22 reserved to talk about managing Nations 3. But just to make
23 sure that we have the lay of the land for today, for the rest
24 of the afternoon I want to just preface that the majority of

1 our time today is focused on the seafood certification
2 question. At your request, we've brought in additional
3 speakers to inform the committee about seafood certification,
4 and that's going to be the majority of our focus this
5 afternoon, hearing presentations, give and take, on that; and
6 then the Seafood Certification Working Group the NIMS and the
7 NOAA staff people who are supporting MAFAC are here to help
8 move that project forward as well.

9 **Priorities for Discussion**

10 MR. HOLLIDAY: So, that's the majority of the
11 (inaudible), but because we are going to spend the majority of
12 tomorrow talking about managing Nations Fisheries 3, we wanted
13 to try to set that up that people were prepared. We want to
14 give you a little bit of time to digest things. And, in fact,
15 you know, if you can remember anything tomorrow about what
16 happened over the last three days, that's probably a priority
17 because it's stuck in your memory rather than just worrying
18 about it today. So, we're giving you overnight to reflect on
19 it.

20 However, there were three concurrent sessions.
21 There were three topics each, so that's a lot of information.
22 Different people went to different places, different ideas of
23 what's important for MAFAC, and our objective is to be looking
24 at, and the reason we came to Managing Nations Fisheries 3, is

1 there are a number of policy-relevant issues that were brought
2 up over these last couple of days, and that's the purpose of
3 MAFAC: To advise the department and NOAA on these big picture
4 issues of policy, direction, vision, and strategy. And so we
5 wanted to make sure that we reserve the time for those things
6 that you want to undertake perhaps as a task for MAFAC over
7 the next 6 to 12 months, things that are on your current
8 agenda that we want to emphasize. So, what did we learn from
9 the Managing Nations 3 to go ahead and form the work before us
10 as a committee?

11 **Discussion Leaders**

12 Heidi has sent out based on your registrations when
13 you registered for the conference, you indicated what sessions
14 you had intended to go to and you may or may not have followed
15 that, which is perfectly fine, but we're trying to see did we
16 have holes? Did we have people who at least could cover these
17 different topics? Because tomorrow we'd like to do this in an
18 organized sort of fashion of having, like, a session leader or
19 somebody who would help lead the discussion who was at the
20 session that was going to be the topic as we would walk
21 through them during the day tomorrow.

22 So, I don't think the PowerPoint slide here is as
23 bright as it could be, but I wanted to just reaffirm that for
24 each of these different areas we had responded say that they

1 were at all these different sessions and we had suggested a
2 couple of different names, and I'm going to read them and see
3 if that's consistent so that we can rely on you tomorrow to
4 help us facilitate the discussion, because I wasn't at all the
5 sessions, and I don't think anybody no one was at all of the
6 sessions, but we want to make sure we can divide that labor
7 up.

8 So, the first Session 2, topic 1. Is that what it
9 says, Heidi? Are we I'm looking at my laptop. Heidi? Is
10 that what it says?

11 MS. LOVETT: I'm sorry

12 MR. HOLLIDAY: Assessing Ecosystem Effects and
13 Integrating Climate Change. Nine members said that they were
14 thinking of going to that one, and we had suggested perhaps as
15 co-leads Ted and Pam Yochem might be willing to help us lead
16 that discussion tomorrow.

17 If you didn't go to that or if you prefer not to,
18 that's fine, but we just want to know who to work with so we
19 can prep for tomorrow properly. Any comments or suggestion
20 from Ted or Pam. Is that are you willing to help with
21 leading those discussions?

22 MR. AMES: I'd be glad to, sure.

1 MR. HOLLIDAY: I know this is tough to say no in
2 front of the crowd. (Laughter) That's intentional.
3 (Laughter)

4 MS. YOCHER: He said yes, so I'm not going to say
5 no.

6 MR. HOLLIDAY: Even worse, right.

7 MR. WALLACE: May I interject something?

8 MR. HOLLIDAY: You may object, yes.

9 MR. WALLACE: Interject?

10 MR. HOLLIDAY: No.

11 MR. WALLACE: Not that matters.

12 MR. HOLLIDAY: Use the microphone, please.

13 MR. WALLACE: Is there any way that we could get, by
14 email, the 128page document that is actually the PowerPoint of
15 each of the presentations? Because that would it would
16 synthesize it would make it easier to remember all the things
17 that were discussed.

18 MR. RIZZARDI: Yes.

19 MR. HOLLIDAY: Yes. So, for the second row on the
20 table, Session 3, topic 2, Integrating Community Protection
21 and Job Emphasis and Domestic Seafood Quality Assurance. I
22 heard from somebody that that was a pretty good one. So,
23 seven people responded that they were attending that, and we
24 identified Michelle and Bob as the

1 Heidi, yes?

2 MS. LOVETT: So, Michelle and Julie Bonney agreed to
3 switch their time and help with that, so it's going to be
4 Julie Bonney and Bob.

5 MR. HOLLIDAY: I see, all right.

6 MS. LOVETT: This was sent out this was this email
7 sent out.

8 MS. BONNEY: It was about communication.

9 MS. LOVETT: We actually did get a 3.2 (inaudible)
10 little discussion. Just letting you know.

11 MR. HOLLIDAY: All right. I know. And I know this
12 is tedious, but because it's important to tomorrow's work I
13 want to make sure that we're in agreement, because once we
14 start on Seafood Certification, we're going to shift gears
15 entirely, and I wanted to clear the decks of this before we
16 moved on. So, if you'll just bear with us for a few minutes,
17 we'll be done.

18 So, Heidi, could you just Julie

19 MS. LOVETT: Yes. Julie Bonney

20 MR. HOLLIDAY: Right.

21 MS. LOVETT: and Bob.

22 MR. HOLLIDAY: Are there other changes that I'm not
23 aware of? Because why don't I just let you do it then if you
24 have other changes.

1 MR. RIZZARDI: Michelle said she could (inaudible),
2 so we're going to need some extra help on Session 3.3. So, we
3 had because they didn't switch out the way they had thought.

4 MS. LOVETT: Okay.

5 MR. RIZZARDI: So, that is your concession.

6 MR. HOLLIDAY: Session 3, topic 3, Assessment and
7 Integration of Social and Economic Tradeoffs, right.

8 MS. YOCHER: Yes, I was there. I will come to the
9 discussion if you explain to me what I mean, to lead the
10 discussion

11 MR. HOLLIDAY: So, for those for the people who
12 weren't at the session, if there's any explanation, if a
13 question comes up about of those 128 ideas, I don't understand
14 what that means and we're serving sort of as a proxy for
15 people who weren't there. It's a resource, because, again,
16 not everybody was at every session. I don't necessarily want
17 or request that you do the full facilitation of the group, but
18 it's a resource to help us move through those issues that were
19 reported out this morning and to see which ones are the
20 relevant ones for MAFAC to look at.

21 So, a couple more. Then we have Session 2, topic 2,
22 Forage Fish Management, Patty Doerr and Dick Brame. Were the
23 suggestions of that we're okay on those two?

24 MS. DOERR: Happy to help.

1 MR. BRAME: Julie was on the panel also.

2 MR. HOLLIDAY: We're not preventing anyone from
3 participating. We're just we needed at least a couple of
4 people to help us out on that. So, thank you.

5 Session 2, topic 3, Integrating Habitat
6 Considerations and Impediments. Six people had signed up to
7 go to that. Columbus and John, I don't if that's okay with
8 you to help do that or whether we need other suggestions.

9 John?

10 MR. BROWN: I was not there, because I was on your
11 panel, so, yeah.

12 MR. HOLLIDAY: Yes, you were. Okay. So, did anyone
13 go to the Integrating Habitat Considerations and Impediments
14 who'd like to at least be available as a reference if we bring
15 that up? Otherwise, it's going to be hard for us to talk
16 about it.

17 MR. WALLACE: I was there.

18 MR. HOLLIDAY: Dave, would you be willing to help
19 out?

20 MR. WALLACE: Yes.

21 **Trigger Questions**

22 MR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you. So, if you haven't had a
23 chance to read Heidi's email about what we're hoping to get
24 out of this, there are trigger questions, and we could resend

1 them to you. I won't belabor the point now, because I'd like
2 to reserve the time. But we're really trying to just focus on
3 what were the themes that were coming out of it, what were
4 those of those 128 recommendations, what are the ones that
5 are most salient to MAFAC and do we want to say something to
6 NOAA about them? Do we want to include them as a topic for
7 further discussion by MAFAC at a future meeting? Is it
8 something that needs further discussion that we want to
9 reserve time at this meeting to make that determination? So,
10 it's to get a feel of what we heard at Managing Nation's
11 Fisheries 3 that's most relevant to us.

12 So, I'll take any questions or comments about what
13 we're trying to do tomorrow. This is the gist of our agenda
14 for Friday.

15 Patty, go ahead.

16 MS. DOERR: Just to make sure I have it straight in
17 my mind, is the goal at the end of the day tomorrow to have a
18 set of issues or recommendations for us to further
19 investigate, to come back to NOAA in October, to have more
20 concrete recommendations or thoughts? Is this just step 1?

21 MR. HOLLIDAY: I think there are multiple steps to
22 this. I think the first is to do a triage. Of those 128
23 ideas, they maybe not all relevant to the interests to the
24 interests of the group and the charge to the committee. So,

1 filtering through those things, some things may have struck
2 you that you wanted to have a reaction to it and just say this
3 was a great idea or it's such a terrible idea or we don't
4 really think it's relevant. And we can move on those things
5 without much further deliberation. Others may be a challenge
6 to us to understand, and there's a lot of thought that would
7 go into what would be the role, and that would be the topic
8 of, you know, future discussions. So, I think the answer to
9 your question is there are multiple possibilities and that's
10 what we're going to try to determine, then just maybe bin into
11 these categories by the end of the day tomorrow versus I don't
12 think we're going to be taking any significant effort to
13 process that information.

14 MR. RIZZARDI: Patty, yes, I think it's like Mark
15 said, I think it's both, and I'd ask everybody to take note of
16 the last question, which is: Of the findings presented, which
17 of those findings does MAFAC endorse as the highest priority?
18 And I think what we're going to find is as we discuss the
19 issues, we'll have near-term priorities and we'll have long-
20 term priorities. And my hope is when you put your budgetary
21 lenses on you'll be able to identify some things that may be
22 our near-term priorities, and we can give some very direct
23 guidance now, and then there are some things that we may

1 decide will be the subject of further discussions and further
2 workshops and further MAFAC meetings down the road.

3 So, think about that last question as something that
4 we could come up with, okay, what can we take away right now
5 from having sat here this week and been through these
6 meetings, and what are we putting on the parking lot that
7 we're going to be putting on the agenda down the road.

8 MR. HOLLIDAY: So, those were the first five of the
9 nine. There are four more left. So, Heidi, if you could
10 scroll down and just quickly touch on them. We may not have
11 time. We were just doing this sort of in the order of how
12 people voted, where they would be going as an index or a proxy
13 for interest. But we could move these up or down as you see
14 fit.

15 Session 1, topic 1, ACL Signs and Implementation
16 Issues. We had suggested Julie and Dick as sort of our
17 sources, references. Did you both go there? Would you be
18 willing to help out as necessary?

19 MR. BRAME: Yeah.

20 MR. HOLLIDAY: Yeah? Okay. Session 3, topic 1,
21 Recreational and Subsistence Fisheries Connections. Three
22 people had said they were planning on going to that one. Liz
23 and Henry, would that be okay with you to help us out there?

1 Henry, thank you. Session 1, topic 3, International
2 Fisheries Management, Leveling the Playing Field. We had,
3 again, three people identify that they were going to that.
4 Henry and Ken, I don't know if you made it to those or not.

5 MR. FRANKE: I caught part of it, but I'll be more
6 than happy to help.

7 MR. HOLLIDAY: (off mic)

8 MR. FRANKE: No, that was one where Mannie was
9 testifying.

10 MR. HOLLIDAY: Yeah, Session you were there.
11 (Laughter) Nah, actually Session 1, topic 3 okay, never
12 mind. Very good.

13 Session 1, topic 2 I'm confusing myself at this
14 point Rebuilding Program Requirements and Timelines.
15 Columbus, you were the sole person who claimed to go, and you
16 did go, and if anyone else was there who can help Columbus out
17 tomorrow, that would be great.

18 All right, so I think we're pretty much done with
19 this agenda item. There just wasn't enough time to do this by
20 email and travel in advance, and I wanted to make sure, so if
21 you we'll get those 128 things out to you this afternoon.
22 You can go through them, and we'll be prepared tomorrow
23 morning then to march through and see which ones are the most

1 relevant, the ones that you want to focus on in the future,
2 okay?

3 Any questions? Good. Good ahead, Columbus.

4 MR. BROWN: I'd be willing to help Julie out on 3-3.

5 MR. RIZZARDI: Okay. Thank you, everybody.

6 Appreciate you taking the time to work our way through that.
7 Mark will be getting us the PowerPoint slides, so hopefully
8 late tonight or tomorrow morning you can grab a few minutes
9 and work your way through the slides that were relevant to the
10 particular presentation that you've been assigned and help
11 lead the discussion tomorrow when we reconvene.

12 **Seafood Certification Work Group**

13 MR. RIZZARDI: And we are now 10 minutes ahead of
14 schedule, which is good because I'm anticipating we'll have
15 some lively discussion, and we'll be turning to the topic of
16 seafood certification. And we've got, as you heard, four
17 presentations today.

18 But I also wanted the membership to know that we've
19 been pretty active on this issue in between meetings. Bob
20 Rheault and I both took a trip up to the Boston seafood show,
21 and we had a chance to talk with a number of folks up there to
22 get perspectives on certification and what role NOAA could and
23 should, if any, play in the dialogue. There's a survey that's
24 been sent out looking for some additional information. So,

1 you know, we're trying to learn a lot here, and that's a big
2 part of what we're trying to accomplish today, which is to
3 learn.

4 So, I'm going to be passing the gavel over to
5 George, who will be leading our discussion and who's been
6 chairing the task force pursuant to the terms of reference
7 with NOAA.

8 And thanks, George, for your leadership.

9 MR. NARDI: Thanks, Keith. What I'll try to do for
10 the next few minutes before the presentations, especially for
11 the new members and the guests, is just to point out if they
12 haven't seen them already that this discussion here at MAFAC
13 is essentially taking place in the context of the terms of
14 reference that I think you can access. And I would also
15 suggest that you might take a look on the website. There is
16 an annotated agenda that also spells out for you gives you a
17 little background on what we're doing and have been doing for
18 the last couple of sessions.

19 To give you some additional background, as I said,
20 we've been reaching out to stakeholders in terms of producers.
21 Whether you're a commercial fisherman, a grower, you're in the
22 distribution chain through to wholesaling and retail as well.

23 I think all of us around the room can appreciate
24 some of and who have been in the industry and watched this

1 need come into place over the last few years that there have
2 been a number of organizations and groups providing
3 certification the lights are on and expanding the breadth of
4 certification. And it's been coming back down on industry,
5 often from the buyer's and market side. And the availability
6 of certification to some of the industry hasn't always been
7 there. Some of the standards that have been written have been
8 for some of the larger commodities.

9 Some of the smaller producers, whether you're a
10 grower or a harvester, may feel a bit disenfranchised when we
11 go to get certification: I just found out so-and-so won't buy
12 my product unless it has a mark or we fill out a form. Where
13 do we go? Who's available to certify this species? No, it's
14 not shrimp. No, it's not catfish. Where do we go?

15 So, we began to ask ourselves some questions. It
16 looked out there like it was beginning to be a little bit like
17 alphabet soup. And we had to sit through a lot of
18 information. Finally, after maybe the technical people on the
19 company staff gathered that information, it came down to
20 what's this going to cost us, George, if we can even gain
21 certification, and what does it mean? So, there was a big
22 economic analysis whether it's at the company and you're
23 looking over finances: What's it worth? Is it a fishery
24 that's being certified? Or is it your company that's being

1 certified that prosecutes a particular fishery? Is it if your
2 neighbor is certified and he's doing the same fishery and you
3 want to jump on the bandwagon can you do so? Or do you go
4 through the same hoops all over again and it costs potentially
5 a very large amount of money?

6 So, that's sort of the context, and what we started
7 to look at was, well, is this something to some degree that
8 and there's no one answer or one size shoe that fits all, but
9 some of the impetus was how can the MAFAC advise NOAA as to
10 providing some level of certification and what level of
11 certification should we be advising or suggesting that NOAA
12 perform that provides the most benefit to their constituency
13 that's producing and distribution seafood?

14 We've had a number of discussions that I think and
15 I do ask any of the MAFAC members who have been here to please
16 speak up if I misspeak in general we were initially looking
17 at and I believe still are but the door is wide open looking
18 at what do we need to get to the buyers to get them to be
19 comfortable in purchasing our product in the context of
20 sustainability? That's a sustainably produced product that
21 they can have confidence in.

22 From that point, you'd launch and go down some
23 paths, potentially to the retail and/or consumer level, and
24 that we are having discussion on. But there was less I think

1 was some lesser concern there. The greater concern and I
2 might be speaking personal and I'll try not to do that is to
3 get to the buyer level, to give them the confidence that my
4 product stands at an opportunity to enter into the marketplace
5 and is sustainable and I can do that without losing an arm and
6 a leg or causing grief at the financial side of my company.

7 So, I hope that sets the context. We are very much
8 still in the gathering of information. So, we've as Keith
9 just said, Keith and Bob and some of the NOAA members, and
10 Laurel, others were at the seafood show and helping to gather
11 information more from the producer side. And some of us also
12 me in particular would also like to be further educated on
13 what the options are. So, we're looking at inviting and
14 thank you for coming representatives from GAA and MSC, and
15 others that could, as well as furthering discussion with the
16 FishWatch Program.

17 So, with that, I'd like to maybe begin the session
18 for the presentations and maybe would we want to take
19 questions after each one or when they're all done?

20 MR. HOLLIDAY: I think our plan was at the
21 conclusion per the discussion. We have a large time period at
22 the end for discussion.

23 MR. NARDI: Okay.

1 MR. HOLLIDAY: If there's a quick question on
2 clarification perhaps, but comments and questions we'll do at
3 the roundtable.

4 **Panel Presentation by External Experts**

5 MR. NARDI: Okay, let me get the agenda. Okay, I
6 think, Kerry, you're first up. Thank you.

7 **Marine Stewardship Council**

8 MS. COUGHLIN: I am, thank you, and we'll hope that
9 the heavens cooperate and you can see what's on the screen.
10 If you can't, I think Heidi's made this available on the web.
11 So, if you're having trouble seeing it, if you have a computer
12 that might help. But hopefully that won't be the case.

13 Before I start, I think some of you do know but let
14 me just point out a couple of people in the room who are key
15 on my team, and that's Jay Lugar, fisheries outreach manager,
16 and Dan Averill, a fisheries outreach manager that leans more
17 toward the West Coast and the other concentrates a little bit
18 more on the East Coast. So, they're a key part of the MSC
19 team. So, I wanted to just point those two folks out to you.

20 So, my objective, as I understand what you wanted
21 from me and what my presentation hopefully will accomplish, is
22 helping to inform this examination that MAFAC has undertaken
23 on seafood certification. So, doing that I'll talk about how
24 MSC fills that kind of a role currently. I'll talk about

1 global versus I think what this group is looking at is a
2 national that powers partnerships around this issue. And then
3 I lay out some considerations that have come to my mind that
4 this group might want to consider as I go forward.

5 So, while my perspective will probably be very
6 predictable today, I would hope that you would also look at it
7 as a voice experience. And my intent is not to preach to you
8 but to inform as much as possible.

9 I'm going to assume that most of you have a basic
10 understanding of the MSC program, so I'm not doing MSC 101.
11 But I have highlighted a few things about what MSC is. We've
12 been around for about 15 years, and we were really created out
13 of market demand, and it was market demand for an
14 international sustainability standard that would be conducted
15 at an independent third party in a very collaborative way.

16 Well, we really don't we have a mission, of course,
17 but other than our mission, which is to preserve livelihoods,
18 preserve fish stocks globally, and food security issues, we
19 don't otherwise have particular agendas.

20 So, the standard was formed as the work it's not
21 six people in a room making this up. It was about 200 to 300
22 scientists from around the world taking two years and when I
23 say "scientists," that included industry, people from the
24 fishing sector, from industry throughout academia,

1 conservation organizations, much as you've seen represented at
2 the conference here who spent a lot of time developing the
3 MSC standard and program and how you would set such a standard
4 and how you would execute that.

5 We operate with a mandate for diverse sector
6 representation. So, again, this is no single sector. Our
7 governors we have three main governing bodies, and they all
8 have a mandate of diverse representation. We're open, we're
9 transparent, and by our design and with our bylaws we are
10 collaborative.

11 We're very much partner based, and I really
12 emphasize the word "service" and the word "partner" that's
13 how we view ourselves at MSC and we are a good global market
14 partner, as well, for fisheries so that there's a benefit to
15 participating in such a program, not that it's a stick but a
16 carrot.

17 What MSC is not: We are absolutely not fishery
18 managers, and we don't see ourselves as fishery managers, we
19 don't act as fishery managers.

20 We are not a for-profit enterprise. So, while we do
21 have to have a structure that that allows for stable operating
22 revenues to service our partners who've invested in the
23 program, money is not a motivator for the MSC.

1 We are not engaged directly in the assessments as
2 the standard setter. We do not engage there wholly
3 independent third-party auditors who conduct the assessments
4 to our standard.

5 We are not a party in any way to the time and
6 expense fees that go to certifiers for an assessment process,
7 as I'll mention later. We are very sensitive, however, to
8 these cost issues and are working very hard to get those down.
9 Even though we're not actually engaged in them, we're
10 sensitive to how that affects the uptake of the program and
11 the access that people could have.

12 And again I'll stress we're not aligned with any one
13 sector.

14 So, in a nutshell, what are we? At this point, we
15 are the world's most recognized and credible seafood
16 sustainability certification program. That's not just our
17 saying that. Independent studies have determined that. We
18 manage two different standards. One is the fishery standard
19 for sustainable and well-managed fishing; and the other, which
20 is very important, is the traceability standard and
21 certification. A certification program without an attached
22 traceability becomes fairly meaningless to the market.

23 We're not a general species rating. It's fishery by
24 fishery, and this sometimes helps fisheries with the program.

1 We think it's the way to address it. Fisheries have told us
2 we have control over our fishery, and if we get grouped into
3 too large a group we can't really affect change; we get up in
4 that. If you get too small, it becomes an access issue. So,
5 we very much encourage certificate sharing for people to come
6 together and have lots of participants sharing in the
7 certificate so you don't have duplicate certifications and the
8 costs are diffused.

9 We have encouraged we actually execute very broad
10 consultation on anything to do with the standard: Maintaining
11 the standard, making improvements to it, evolving it. For
12 example, right now we're undertaking what we're calling the
13 fishery standard review. This is under the FAO guidelines.
14 As a standard setter we need to review it every five years,
15 and that's what we're engaged in right now. And that's very
16 consultative. If you have any interest you can go to our
17 website and find out how to participate. And we're also going
18 to be conducting actual workshops around, so we encourage
19 participation in that.

20 As part of that, it's back to this issue of cost
21 speed and cost. We really work to try to get these things
22 down, but there's a certain threshold to be a credible
23 certification program. So, you just can't cut all the corners
24 off.

1 Very objective, scientifically verifiable. Again,
2 open, transparent and, again, the key element of being third
3 party.

4 This slide just gives you a really quick overview of
5 sort of the global nature of the program. And I want to
6 really talk a little bit about that global perspective as you
7 consider something with a national focus, because seafood is
8 the largest traded primary commodity in the world and we know
9 that the U.S. imports over 90 percent of its seafood.

10 Now, some of that is disguised, because it gets
11 reprocessed. It's U.S. fish that gets reprocessed and comes
12 in. But nevertheless, that's a very high figure, so a lot of
13 the seafood we consume comes from elsewhere.

14 So, one of the things as a global program that MSC
15 brings to the table is we can help with that issue of unequal
16 competition with the less well-managed fisheries. Working
17 with market partners and others around the world, we help to
18 bring some of those fisheries up to the same level of
19 management. If they have to meet a certain standard, that's
20 helpful in the competition arena for our U.S. Fisheries.

21 International buyers' source from many countries.
22 They want a global program; they want a program that's
23 independent from industry and management. And that's one

1 reason that the MSC standard was created the way it was, to be
2 a completely independent and global program.

3 There are more than 2300 companies now worldwide
4 that have chain of custody, and that translates to about
5 33,000 sites around the world that already have this system in
6 place.

7 Areas that we see growing in the global context
8 we're getting a lot of pressure from a lot of areas, but some
9 of the key ones are really throughout Asia, throughout Latin
10 America but also North America and Europe, and that's both
11 commercial and fishery uptake in the program.

12 One of the things we're putting a big emphasis on
13 and have special projects around is access for small-scale
14 fisheries, and that's not just developing world, but that's
15 also developed world small-scale fisheries. So, how can we
16 help deal with that? There are some areas of the world coming
17 up with some creative ways. The government of Western
18 Australia, for example, has grouped fisheries and they've
19 embarked with a project in MSC to put all of their fisheries
20 through a certification process and creating efficiencies
21 around that. There's a similar project in the U.K. to take
22 all the unsure small-scale fisheries through. So, there are
23 creative ways to get at that access issue.

1 This just gives you a quick sense of some of the
2 commercial global commitment. It's just a taste of some
3 logos, just to give you a sense.

4 And I'm going to stay on this context of commercial
5 this is not to give you an update on the MSC commercial. But,
6 again, it's this global perspective. When companies like
7 Sodexo they're able to commit to a program and source all the
8 way across for 80 countries in the world. So, again, this is
9 why the global tends to be really important in seafood
10 certification. And I mentioned a project just here in
11 Washington, D.C., with some of the iconic institutions that
12 are globally focused but based here that have signed on with
13 the MSC program.

14 Colleges and universities. A lot of interest and a
15 lot of uptake there. It's a natural constituency to be very
16 interested in conservation, in the environment. And so that
17 translates as well. They're very conscious seafood consumers
18 on campuses, so we're seeing a lot of uptake on that.

19 Media. We have as a global organization and it's
20 taken us 15 years to really build this up really built up a
21 reputation where a lot of the media come to us on these issues
22 of seafood certification.

1 I just have to mention my favorite one is the bottom
2 center one, which is an astronaut on the space station who's
3 floating a can of Alaska salmon that's certified sustainable.

4 This gives you an idea, back to the U.S., of the
5 percentage by volume of landings in the U.S. that are already
6 engaged in the MSC program. So, this is a lot of
7 certification work here in the U.S. that's really already been
8 done, much of it using NOAA data, NOAA statistics. So, that's
9 over the last 10 years or so. Quite an extensive body of
10 work.

11 So, it's our view at the MSC that we can really if
12 we partner well with all of our partners achieve the aims
13 that we're trying to aim together. We're more powerful
14 together, so one of the things that we do is we strongly
15 encourage the promotion of U.S. local, regional, state,
16 national providence on the labeling. And I've put just a few
17 examples here. The Bar Harbor Chowder: You can't read it at
18 the top, but it says "Fresh off the docks of Maine." And this
19 is Oregon wild-caught. Right above "the cooked salad shrimp,"
20 it gives the origin.

21 And this promotion here on the right is a promotion
22 with a large chain in the northeast, Big Y stores. And they
23 did a big promotion with their customers in-store, and that
24 features the NOAA secret inspection program label. These are

1 the types of co-promotions that we strongly encourage and want
2 to work with partners to do. So, MSC does not have an
3 interest in being exclusive or in being a brand ourselves of
4 any kind.

5 This is a difficult-to-see Whole Foods example, but,
6 again, all the signage prominently promotes the U.S. Fishery
7 origin of the fish.

8 Same thing with Walmart: This is a circular that
9 was distributed to 90 million U.S. households, and it talks
10 about Bristol Bay sockeye salmon, Alaska wildcaught on all
11 this packaging.

12 Probably the granddaddy of all of these recently was
13 the announcement by McDonald's that they were going with a
14 hundred percent MSC-certified seafood. But what we were very
15 pleased to see and worked hard with them on in putting this
16 together was their promotion of the source fishery. So,
17 again, this is something that we really promote. So, what
18 this says on the package here is "Wild-caught Alaska pollock
19 responsibly sourced from an MSC-certified fishery." There's a
20 website, then, that you can go to to get more information that
21 also features the fishery quite prominently. When that launch
22 took place there are a few examples here of some of the
23 mainstream media coverage it was the number one story on
24 Yahoo that day and in all of the mainstream media. And,

1 again, all of this featured the source fishery and featured
2 the Alaska pollock fishery in this case.

3 Trade media, same kind of thing: It was the
4 dominant story in trade media for some time.

5 But this one in particular, though, is one that, to
6 me, really speaks to the kind of partnership where McDonald's,
7 in doing this launch, decided to really feature this source
8 fishery, and they did a campaign that reached 30 million
9 people that went out through these publications and more
10 publications, full-page ads. This features Kenny Longacre,
11 who's a Dutch Harbor fisherman, and they did a video that they
12 used in ads that they put on websites. They put him in the
13 full-page ad, and it talks it's the story of the fishermen
14 and the story of the fishermen that catch the fish that you,
15 as a customer in McDonald's, eat.

16 So, McDonald's they have a huge reach. They serve
17 25 million people a day just in the U.S. alone. So, from the
18 MSC perspective, it's this kind of partnership that we really
19 one of the things we try to achieve, and I think we do, is
20 giving U.S. fisheries credit for sustainable management in
21 these types of promotions around the world. MSC is very
22 careful. We never claim credit for that sustainability. It's
23 the work whether it's a U.S. Fishery (inaudible), it's the
24 work of the fishery. The program may incentivize or promote

1 those fisheries that aren't yet sustainable, but for those
2 that are, we always bill it as those fisheries are using the
3 MSC program to convey that good management and sustainability.

4 Sometimes it feels to the fishermen and harvesters,
5 I think, like they're left out of the equation, because it
6 generally takes an association or a group or processors and
7 the companies to come forward. But the fishermen actually do
8 get benefit from MSC certification in the global market,
9 because while it may seem indirect and they don't have that
10 direct contact, they really do benefit from the market access,
11 more stable supply relationships, higher demand, in some cases
12 higher prices, an international reputation, and greater media
13 exposure. I gave the example of the Alaska fishermen, but we
14 do a series of Meet the Fisher videos around a suite of our
15 fisheries and promote those globally.

16 So, you can't read these, but as I say there's a
17 link. You can go back if you can't read these. But these are
18 a number of testimonials out of the industry sector and out of
19 the fisheries that talk about the benefits of being in an MSC
20 program and the benefits of that global certification. And we
21 have a fairly high rate of recertification, so we think these
22 fisheries are receiving benefits. They're businesses. They
23 don't do it to be entirely altruistic. They do it because it

1 somehow is in their business interest, and we hope to continue
2 to be a good partner that way.

3 So, I will turn to some considerations that I've put
4 forward for this group, and again I stress I put these out,
5 in all humility, for you to consider. I'm not trying to
6 preach at you, but as you consider looking at creating a
7 certification program, there is no way to really avoid the
8 issue of grading your own homework if you create your own
9 program. So, if you assess and certify your own work as
10 fishery managers, that's going to create problems. It makes
11 it not a truly independent third-party program, and that's not
12 compliant with FAO guidelines if you're a first or second
13 party.

14 We already know that conservation organizations are
15 not generally favorable to this idea, and we know, having been
16 in this business for a number of years, that like it or not
17 that's very important, and those partnerships have been very
18 important, and I think all of you value that as well. So, I
19 think that's a group you don't want to alienate.

20 There have been international benchmarking
21 evaluations done. They will downgrade a program they don't
22 consider to be truly independent or third party, and that can
23 be damaging to the reputation of that organization. I don't
24 say that in any smug or competitive way, but I think it's

1 true. And there's another big project starting up around that
2 with the GSSI initiative that we think will probably be
3 attempting to narrow the field a little bit further even by
4 doing independent benchmarking.

5 So, you also, I think, earlier this week have been
6 wrestling with some of these issues around highly migratory,
7 so if you do a national certification, how is that going to
8 work in the arena of these overlapping areas where you have
9 tribal or internationally managed fishery issues? And there's
10 the issue, also, of then how does that certification help to
11 level the playing field so it's outside of just the national
12 boundaries, the national waters? How would that figure into
13 the competitiveness?

14 There are issues around cost and efficiency. I can
15 tell you it's costly to develop and operate a credible
16 certification and labeling program. And I put an example up
17 here. This is not to denigrate ASME by any means, but it is
18 an example of a program that's been perceived as a free
19 program. But their board approved a total, if you add it up
20 together, a budget of about \$7 million of taxpayer and
21 industry money to create the program, engage the first
22 fisheries, and then promote that program throughout Europe and
23 elsewhere. So, that's just one example, but I use it as a
24 non-MSA example of there are costs. No matter what you think

1 you can layer this on top of, something you're already doing,
2 those time and expense costs, they're just there, and they're
3 very difficult to avoid. So, there are costs.

4 In the MSC's cost structure, one of the reasons it
5 was designed the way it was, stability, one, is the
6 organizational support can grow as the program grows; but a
7 lot of it is that the program costs are spread to the end
8 user, so to operate a program like the MSC standard, a lot of
9 that is paid for by the end users. For example, with Alaska
10 salmon, over 80 percent of the royalty fees on that are paid
11 by Europeans, not by the U.S. So, it helps spread that burden
12 out rather than concentrate it.

13 If buyers still are going to require MSC
14 certification, which some of them are still insistent on, if
15 another certification program is built in, is that going to
16 overburden the system or overburden the industry if they're
17 then faced with requirements for multiple certification
18 programs. The MSC is a voluntary program of course.

19 NOAA data right now and it's provided to assessors
20 in accordance with NOAA's policy of no new work, so NOAA
21 doesn't undertake special projects solely for the purpose of
22 MSC certification. But NOAA has been a great partner in
23 providing existing data and essentially through that process
24 is really helping get this job done of U.S. Fishery

1 certification in a way that's cost-neutral, low additional
2 effort as far as government expense. So, in some ways this is
3 already being achieved but without the cost and diversion of
4 resources it would represent for government.

5 Aquaculture: We already partnered MSC with ASC,
6 including GAA and others. We're open to using our chain of
7 custody certification traceability program for the aquaculture
8 certification programs, and I'm sure Molly will talk a little
9 more about aquaculture later, so I won't dwell on that, but
10 there is this would staying with MSC keep an aquaculture
11 pipeline open for traceability.

12 And I just want to clarify cost and efficiencies.
13 There are rumors of \$2 million certifications for MSC
14 assessments. That's a myth. We know of no such expense for
15 certification.

16 And, finally, confusion around communication and
17 communication challenges. There's already a serious concern
18 right now about the number of eco labels, confusion in the
19 marketplace. It's always been our philosophy the market will
20 choose, and they're doing that, but it's starting to get to
21 the point where we all might undermine ourselves if we just
22 heap too many labels on at once and they start to become
23 meaningless. That could, I think, challenge all of us in
24 communicating unsustainable seafood issues.

1 Developing its own label could spawn challenges,
2 really, to the excellent and well-deserved reputation of NOAA
3 fisheries as fishery managers. And I say that because you do
4 have a well-deserved and excellent reputation. You serve as
5 model around the world. As soon as you say, well, we're going
6 to do our own certification and certify ourselves, I think
7 there's a concern of how that would be perceived
8 reputationally.

9 And also the proliferation of labels. If NOAA
10 undertakes one, you know, that's just one more contributing
11 but you would then also experience that competition of labels.

12 So, we've learned that communicating with a really
13 broad consumer base regarding sustainable seafood is a very
14 expensive and very extensive undertaking. MSC doesn't have
15 the budget of CocaCola. We're not we can't get to be a
16 household concept, you know, with a billion-dollar advertising
17 budget. But we've built up over the years a network so that
18 through our retail and other partners we can leverage that.
19 And we do have a much more extensive reach. So, in my mind
20 Laurel's going to talk to us a little bit later about
21 FishWatch, but that's a really good place to put resources for
22 NOAA when it comes to building the reputation around the
23 sustainability of U.S. fisheries, and I think that can be an

1 excellent tool, and I think it's a much more feasible
2 application of resources to carry that message.

3 What do we see in the future? I think the coin
4 could go either way. Either we'll get too many labels and it
5 will just weaken the majority of them or market consolidation
6 will know to a few. I think there's some dynamic on either
7 one side or the other that's going to take place.

8 And, finally, I want to just stress that I think MSC
9 and NOAA have opportunities to work even more closely together
10 and be supportive in partnership in an appropriate way,
11 recognizing the neutrality of our standard and of course the
12 neutrality of the government in managing its fisheries. But I
13 think there are ways to do that. Our policy process at MSC as
14 we evolve the standard is absolutely wide open to
15 participation, and so we would be very open to ideas on how to
16 partner even more closely, and that's around communication but
17 also around supporting this nation's fisheries and how we can
18 bring better value to this nation's fisheries.

19 And, finally, I'll just leave you with this concept.
20 It's not mine. But it came from a comic strip, but I think
21 it's extremely apropos to the discussion today.

22 And I thank you very much for your attention today,
23 and I understand that we'll be taking questions later, not
24 now. Thank you very much.

1 MR. RIZZARDI: George, can I just get one
2 clarification? There was a slide that puzzled me. It was the
3 one about the 58 percent of the fisheries being certified.

4 MS. COUGHLIN: Yes, and that's a figure by volume.
5 Fifty eight percent of the fisheries are engaged in the MSC
6 program.

7 MR. RIZZARDI: And it's so, that means that of
8 those fisheries of the members of that fishery who are
9 participating in the MSC program. It's not like a whole
10 fishery effort.

11 MS. COUGHLIN: That's total. That's out of total
12 U.S. landings.

13 MR. RIZZARDI: Total U.S. landings

14 MS. COUGHLIN: Out of total U.S. landings.

15 MR. RIZZARDI: Thank you.

16 MS. COUGHLIN: And obviously with the pollock and
17 Alaska fisheries being in that, that's a big part of that
18 figure.

19 MR. HOLLIDAY: So, just a reminder as we get set for
20 the next presentation, these two PowerPoints are on the MAFAC
21 website. If you can't see the screen, you can log on using
22 wireless and follow on your laptop if you have it with you.

23 MR. NARDI: Thanks, Mark. Molly?

1 **Best Aquaculture Practices Certification Standards of the**
2 **Global Aquaculture Alliance**

3 MS. METCALF: All right, thank you again for having
4 me today. I was happy to come down and visit even if just for
5 a short period of time. I'm going to talk a little bit about
6 aquaculture and the Global Aquaculture Alliance. It will be a
7 little more of aquaculture or BAP 101 for you, just to go over
8 what we are doing in terms of sustainability standards. So,
9 let's get started here.

10 The GAA is to give you some background, we are a
11 nonprofit association. Our mission is to further
12 environmentally responsible aquaculture in order to meet world
13 food needs. We are constantly articulating the importance of
14 aquaculture as a source of food and employment, but we are
15 also supporting technological research in providing the
16 information openly through membership, as well as with
17 research facilities. We are constantly advocating for the
18 industry, whether it's regionally or globally, as well as
19 promoting effective, coordinated government regulatory and
20 international trade policies. So, that's the long and short
21 of the mission.

22 Just to go beyond that a little bit, it's not just
23 about our standards that we have. It's not all you know,
24 it's not just about we want BAP certification for all

1 aquaculture. Education is a huge part of what we do. We
2 think it's extremely important to continue, you know, research
3 on the aquaculture side and constantly improve what we have
4 going on.

5 To give a couple of examples, recently through Dr.
6 Donald Lightner at the University of Arizona he had a group
7 that was doing a lot of research on the EMS disease in shrimp,
8 and they recently identified what that disease was. So, we
9 partner with groups like that to continue the research to
10 improve. We also, as Kerry just mentioned, just signed in
11 Brussels a Memorandum of Understanding with obviously, it was
12 BAP, ASC, and Global Gap; and, again, that's just you know,
13 the objective of that is for the groups to get together to
14 increase the value and utility and access to the efficiency of
15 our certification programs. It's for the benefit of all
16 aquaculture stakeholders who are really committed to the big
17 picture. It goes beyond just what we obviously are doing.

18 So, a little bit about the mission. We started in
19 '97 based out of an industry need. There were concerns in the
20 industry on the shrimp side of things. There was a need to
21 figure out what improvements could have been made on the
22 aquaculture side. So, that's actually where GAA came from.
23 It was an industry need. It was 59 aquaculture stakeholders
24 from all over the world that came together to get it going.

1 We have, currently, over 1,100 members across the world in
2 different sectors. Whether it's aquaculture feed or cold
3 storage facilities, all different kinds of companies are
4 within our membership.

5 As well, in terms of the financing model, we are a
6 nonprofit, so we're funded in a few different ways.
7 Membership fees and sponsorship are a small part of how we are
8 funded. Our two big our funding programs would be our annual
9 conference, which is the Global Outlook for Aquaculture
10 Leadership. We have that this year it's in Paris, France, so
11 for those of you who are committed to responsible aquaculture
12 we would encourage you to look into that and perhaps be part
13 of the meeting. It's not about waving our BAP flag and we're
14 so great. It's really to get aquaculture stakeholders in a
15 room to talk about what's going on today and what we see
16 coming forward and what the challenges are really going to be
17 for the industry. So, it's a really great way to it's a
18 great networking avenue, but it's also just a really great way
19 for the industry to come together and look at what the big
20 picture is going forward. And then, as well, our standard
21 site, our BAP program or our Best Aquaculture Practices
22 program that's the other piece of funding.

23 We do have a bimonthly magazine, but that really
24 doesn't fund it in any way. That's kind of a wash, so it's a

1 really neat magazine as well. It's very technically driven,
2 but something we really have a strong commitment to doing
3 that as well, obviously the education piece of what we do.

4 And just as a general commentary, the GAA we're
5 just a massive resource of aquaculture expertise. As I said,
6 we have we're a global industry. We have connections
7 everywhere. Everyone is committed to responsible aquaculture,
8 so outside of this meeting if you ever want to reach out to
9 me, we are happy to connect with people to talk about
10 aquaculture.

11 So, the BAP program you'll see we have GAA; we have
12 BAP; we have MSC; we have there's all kinds of acronyms. So,
13 if at any point you need me to clarify, please stop me.

14 So, BAP is the Best Aquaculture Practices program.
15 It is a business-to-consumer pack label, that blue logo that
16 you will see in a few of these slides here. That's the BAP
17 logo. So, it is being used on pack.

18 The standards themselves are robust standards. They
19 are for aquaculture facilities throughout the production
20 chain. So, it isn't just for a farm. We do certify a
21 processing plant, as well as hatcheries and feed mills. We
22 think it's really important to look at each step of the
23 production chain, because there could be something really
24 great going on at the farm level. But if the processor is

1 discharging wastewater directly into a river, that is going to
2 undo all the good that really happened before. So, we think
3 it's important to look at the full chain and address the
4 issues there. Standards also have, as I mentioned, the
5 building block approach, so we have typically a one-star
6 certified would mean that processor has the certification, and
7 you typically add in farm hatchery, feed mill. So, there are
8 different levels there. In terms of smaller farms, we do have
9 an integrated operating module targeted toward smaller
10 entities that can come together as a group and enter into
11 certification, as well as just the ISO 65 governed third-party
12 certification. So, as Kerry was saying, we certainly want to
13 separate church and state. We should not be policing
14 ourselves with what we do. So, we are very transparent and
15 careful about the program, and we set up the standards, but we
16 don't certify them ourselves. That's done by the third
17 parties.

18 In terms of the BAP standards and their scope, as I
19 mentioned we cover the entire production chain. So, you can
20 see across the top, those block pictures there, the feed,
21 hatchery, farm, and processing. So, those are the feed
22 standard. We also cover a variety of species that you can see
23 there on the left-hand side. We had a salmon standard as well
24 as we just revised our farm standard, so we have included a

1 variety of other species. It was tilapia, catfish, pangasius
2 that we were looking at, but now we've opened the doors to
3 other species. Barramundi would be a new opportunity, perch,
4 trout, sea bass, as well as a variety of other species and a
5 variety of farming methods whether it's closed containment
6 tanks or open water farms, or even things like mussels that
7 have just come up. We just opened our mussel standard, so we
8 are adding standards, which is great. It hasn't been easy,
9 but we are constantly growing, which is fantastic.

10 Within each of the standards themselves, we cover
11 these five important notes here that you'll see on the bottom
12 left-hand side. So, within each standard we will address
13 social concerns, the environment, animal welfare, food safety,
14 and then, obviously, traceability.

15 So, to get in a little bit deeper, to give you more
16 examples of what each of those categories might cover, on the
17 social ethics side, obviously, we're going to look at things
18 like property rights, regulatory compliance, community
19 relations. In the environment piece we look at sediment and
20 water quality all the way to the fishmeal side of things,
21 escapes, storage and disposal, animal welfare, obviously the
22 health and welfare of the animals themselves, as well as bio-
23 security and disease management.

1 Food safety: We'll look at things like residues,
2 some contaminates but also the harvest and transport of the
3 product, and then traceability is recordkeeping.

4 Just to delve in a little bit more, the basis of the
5 BAP standards is, we demand that the company is in compliance
6 with local regulations. So, that's within the standard
7 itself. But we obviously then go above and beyond what those
8 local regulations really are, and we obviously cover these
9 different elements. So, it's not strictly an environmental
10 standard. We are looking at the social concerns that are
11 going on today, as well as covering the animal welfare/food
12 side safety side of things. But inherently the program
13 requires companies to, obviously, comply with the local laws
14 that already exist.

15 So, in terms of the development of the standards,
16 you know, it's important to go over as I said, we are very
17 transparent. We are very careful to, as I said, separate
18 church and state. We're careful not to police ourselves. So,
19 when we develop the standards themselves, we have what's
20 called the Standards Oversight Committee, also known as the
21 SOC. We felt it was extremely important to involve everyone
22 who might have a say in an aquaculture standard and in farming
23 fish. So, we involved three different groups of people. We
24 have and this is also the number of people that are in the

1 committee so, within the NGO community we have four people
2 from that group. We'll have four members that are from the
3 industry itself. And there are four members from the
4 academic, regulatory, and policy side of things. So, you can
5 imagine that those three groups of people and even within
6 each of those groups we'll often or most of the time have
7 conflicting views on how to, for example, farm-raise a fish.
8 But we thought in order to be as transparent as possible and
9 to do, really, what was best for everyone in the big picture,
10 we had to involve everyone in the conversation.

11 So, that Standards Oversight Committee their job
12 ultimately is to approve or deny the standard. So, they will
13 ultimately vote on it. We do require that a minimum of two
14 NGOs vote yes for the standard to be approved. Obviously,
15 with 12 members we could have excluded one group of people if
16 we choose to just go with majority, but we do require that at
17 least two from each group vote yes. Thankfully, all the
18 standards have gone through unanimously. That does not mean
19 that it was without lots of work and a lot of time. But,
20 thankfully, we have been able to get all the standards through
21 unanimously.

22 Below the SOC is the Technical Committee. This
23 group is developed for each standard that we create. So, the
24 most recent standard that came out was our mussel standard.

1 We created a technical committee. It was comprised of the
2 same three groups of people, so they still had four NGOs, four
3 industry, four academic reg or policy. But these folks have
4 specific knowledge about farm-raising mussels. Obviously,
5 that's going to be extremely important to hash out all the ins
6 and outs of creating a standard. So, the Technical Committee
7 gets together, they draft it, and then ultimately it goes back
8 up to the Standards Oversight Committee, who will vote yes or
9 no on the standard. So, that's the creation of the standard
10 itself.

11 The GAA: We basically set up phone calls or buy
12 coffee and basically just get them where they need to go. We
13 are separate from that process.

14 In terms of continuous improvement, we do an annual
15 review with a revision at least every three years, but we have
16 made revisions annually if that is necessary. The industry is
17 constantly changing, so we have to make sure that we're
18 changing or updating our standards along with the industry.
19 There are constant advancements, so we have to be on top of
20 that. So, annual reviews of the standards themselves is
21 critical.

22 We have commitment to conformance with the FAO
23 guidelines. We drive our standards around that. We look to
24 being in conformance with those guidelines. Also, in addition

1 to that for our processing plants standard, we do have GFSI
2 equivalency. So, the global food safety initiative has
3 benchmarked a variety of standards for the food safety side of
4 things, and the BAP processing standard is recognized within
5 that group. That's obviously to try and that's to prevent a
6 company from meeting various certifications for the same
7 thing, whether it's BAP, BRC. You know, we can go on and on
8 forever. So, we do have that as well on the food safety side
9 of things.

10 So, if we go on to the certification process itself,
11 this is just a pictorial of what all I've said so far. You
12 can see the BAP standards get created; the GAA just organizes
13 that whole process that's above the dotted line.

14 So, there is a public comment piece that I didn't
15 mention previously, so before a standard goes live, there is a
16 public comment period that happens. So, again, we are
17 involving everyone in the process.

18 Once the standard is created, the certification
19 process happens with the ISO 65 bodies. There's a third party
20 certifying body. So, that piece is separate. Those are some
21 of the entities that we work with to do the audits themselves,
22 but this just outlines for the separation of the two.

23 So, the BAP difference. Again, just to summarize,
24 our program has a four-star certification as the highest

1 level. We have that building block approach. There are no
2 royalties for the logo use, just as a side note. We cover
3 each step of the production chain, and within the standards
4 themselves we are covering a variety of different elements as
5 I said. It's not just the environment. We are looking at
6 social concerns: Animal warfare, food safety, and
7 traceability. We are looking at those every single year.

8 We require that a company get certified every year,
9 so they are audited annually and recertified, obviously, when
10 they pass. We do have the option for smaller farm groups to
11 come together as a unit and get certified together, so we are
12 open. We want to make sure we can be as inclusive as
13 possible, so in terms of the certification side we look to
14 include everyone in that as well.

15 We're independent and have transparent governance,
16 significance experience in the field, and 10+ years that we've
17 actually been certifying companies, whether it's plants,
18 farms, hatcheries, or feed mills.

19 Also training programs. Again, our commitment to
20 the education side of what we do is there. And this is a
21 training program that happens on the auditor side of things,
22 auditors that will inspect for our standard, go through
23 training, specific so that they have knowledge of BAP. But
24 even beyond that, we have trainings that we are doing around

1 the globe with farmers in different countries just to
2 education them on responsible aquaculture. So, we're really
3 committed to that globally, really advancing the aquaculture
4 industry.

5 So, does certification make a difference? This is
6 something that we obviously felt the GAA felt we were making
7 some kind of difference, but we had not figured out a way to
8 put that out on paper. You know, we thought maybe we'd make
9 20 percent difference in the industry. We knew, obviously,
10 companies had to change their businesses in order to get our
11 certification, but we wanted to find out, really, how much of
12 a difference we could make. So, we coordinated with Michael
13 Tlusty at the New England Aquarium, and basically what we did
14 is we handed him all of our shrimp farm files. We didn't
15 discriminate. We actually took them all and we gave him the
16 information, and we said please figure out what kind of a
17 difference we're making. So, we handed everything over to
18 him, and this is a little background on what his findings
19 were.

20 So, as I mentioned, we gave him all of our files,
21 and it was specific to shrimp farms, so it was globally shrimp
22 farms that have gone through the BAP certification process.
23 There were a handful, maybe 5 to 10 companies that entered
24 into the process. You can see that top dotted line that goes

1 to the right. They ended up not participating in the program,
2 for whatever reason. We don't know all those reasons
3 necessarily, but they thought about it and then they said, eh,
4 now I'm not going to do it. So, that was probably only 5 to
5 10 groups.

6 So, there were 265 companies that decided to go
7 through with BAP certification. What we found is that the red
8 arrow to the left-hand side 10 of those 265 tried to get
9 certified, but they just couldn't do it for a variety of
10 reasons, so a relatively small number when you look at the big
11 group. When you look at the big green arrow going out to the
12 right-hand side of the 265, there were 130 companies that
13 actually passed the first go-around, which is great. But the
14 most important number was the one in the middle, and that was
15 125 companies that went to get BAP certified. They had
16 nonconformities. I'll get into a little bit about what
17 nonconformities would be, but they had some issues that
18 required change in order for them to receive certification.
19 And, most importantly, the 125 did make those changes to get
20 their certification. So, we found that almost in 50 percent
21 of the cases we did make some kind of difference.

22 Now, the nonconformities the areas with the most
23 issues were in the drug or chem management side of things, as
24 well as effluent control, that waste discharge. But there

1 were certainly some nonconformities that could have been as
2 small as was their toilet paper in the employee restroom that
3 was visible. I mean, it could have been something that was a
4 little smaller, but, on the whole, we did find that 50 percent
5 of these organizations had to make changes to get certified
6 and, in fact, they made those changes. So, we were thrilled
7 to see that the number was greater than the 20 percent that we
8 had originally thought. So, thankfully, we found that we were
9 making quite a bit of difference.

10 MS. DOERR: You've run out of time.

11 MS. METCALF: Oh, I've run out of time, excuse me.

12 (Laughter) Okay, so just to summarize making a difference,
13 again it was not a random sample. We did hand over all our
14 files, so they did have the whole lot of them, and thankfully
15 half of them made some changes. In terms of the 50 percent
16 that passed, the first go-around had greater score values.
17 Within the system, the audit system there are items that are
18 pass/fail items. So, you have to pass all of those in order
19 to move on. But there are elements that are created 0 to 3,
20 so you do not actually need a company doesn't need all 3s in
21 order to pass. They can have some other numbers in there, but
22 what that enables us to do is really see what improvements
23 they need to make. And so in the next year when they get
24 certified we are looking at those values and making sure that

1 there is constant improvement within the company itself. So,
2 as I mentioned, for the nonconforming, those guys that made
3 changes, the effluent standards were a big challenge for them
4 so that waste discharge we obviously made a significant
5 improvement there where they had to make changes for effluent
6 control.

7 But, again, the yearly checks are extremely
8 important, which, again, we do every year. We check our own
9 standards every year, but we also a company gets audited
10 every single year.

11 And I think that that is it. Is that it? Sorry.
12 Yes, the end.

13 MR. NARDI: Thanks, Molly. Any quick questions or
14 clarifications? Okay.

15 Thor?

16 **Systems Assessment of Federal/State Fishery Management**
17 **Programs**

18 MR. LASSEN: Good afternoon. I plan to just quickly
19 introduce myself, introduce Ocean Trust I always think it's
20 good for people to know the perspective that I'm bringing
21 forward and where that came from and then talk a little bit
22 about an initiative that we're involved in, how we got there,
23 that is a little bit different. It is a pilot assessment
24 process, and I'll kind of present it to you. It's on the web.

1 One thing I'll say off the top is that it, in no
2 way, is a means to replace any of the existing programs,
3 certainly not MSC, GAA, anything else. It's just a different
4 approach to look at the system of a systems approach to
5 certifications. In fact, there are still roles for third-
6 party participation, third-party assessments.

7 The second thing I want to point out in the
8 beginning is we're not in the business of creating standards.
9 I never wanted to get in that position myself. These are
10 public resources, and my feeling has always been that it's the
11 responsibility of sovereign nations to make those decisions
12 about how those public resources are managed and used. As you
13 know, sometimes it's for maximum food production; sometimes
14 it's for employment. Every nation and every situation has a
15 different sort of objective. So, we're not introducing new
16 standards. We are kind of using and looking at the standards
17 that have been established by, in this case, the United States
18 and state governments and how it complies with FAO standards,
19 FAO being also sort of a government institutional
20 organization.

21 So, with that I'll kind of just start. First of
22 all, my background is marine science. I came from the
23 Chesapeake Bay and, as Mark pointed out yesterday, some of his
24 staff I was also a Knauss Fellow, probably one of the

1 original ones from 1980, so there's life after the fellowship.

2 (Laughter)

3 I worked in the commissions, sat on the councils in
4 the New England and MidAtlantic regions, worked within the
5 industry, National Fisheries Institute, and worked with a
6 number of associations. One was the National Fisheries
7 Education Research Foundation, and most of our work there was
8 on HACCP development. This was a partnership project with
9 NOAA, and I mention it because it was a significant shift on
10 how we look at food safety. We went from pulling samples off
11 the lines into a systems approach to ensuring food safety, and
12 in some ways I've had people tell me that what we're trying to
13 do and evaluate in sustainability is quite similar, because
14 we're trying to encourage a systems approach to certifications
15 of sustainable seafood.

16 I got involved in Ocean Trust in 1992 and have been
17 with them ever since. We're a nonprofit education foundation.
18 We get funding from corporate members, from foundations,
19 grants government grants sometimes. We've had a lot of
20 different partners that expand from NGOs to commercial to REC.
21 Government organizations have a very small board, but we've
22 been fortunate to be involved in some issues that have gotten
23 recognition and produce some very good results. I managed to
24 find a picture of myself with Rebecca, sitting in for Raleigh.

1 But we've had a lot of relationship with NOAA. We also work
2 quite well with industry partners, and you can see some of the
3 same partners that are active today in the sustainability
4 issues you know, Darden, Publix, Whole Foods, et cetera, and
5 I think that's a very good thing that they were kind of
6 working across the board with different organizations.

7 We have three areas of focus: Fisheries, wildlife,
8 and the environment. We do workshops, have done them for
9 years. We've been involved in sea turtle restoration; we keep
10 the marina restoration; and for 10 years we were a national
11 partner with NOAA in habitat restoration.

12 We got involved in sustainability. Well, we've
13 always been involved in sustainability in discussions, but,
14 more precisely, in 2010 we started a series of workshops on
15 science and sustainability to try to provide some answers to
16 seafood buyers, corporate buyers, who kind of wanted to cut
17 through the chase and have a direct dialogue with the
18 scientists, and that's what we did. We set up a forum. We
19 brought in scientists from all over the world, depending on
20 the species of interest. And, as a result, we've had people
21 from FAO, ICES, NAFO, CCAMLR, depending on the species of
22 interest, and we let the buyers kind of choose.

23 A lot of different partners. We've done three of
24 these, and we will probably do one in 2014. We've been moving

1 around the country with these forums. And this is really
2 where this project started that I'm going to talk about.

3 Our science partner is the American Institute of
4 Fishery Research Biologists. We wanted to have a strong
5 science background, and so that's who we've been working with.
6 And some of the findings from this group have been
7 interesting, to say the least. This is on the website, but
8 contrary what you hear a lot, there's been a lot of success in
9 reducing overfishing in general and a lot of success in
10 rebuilding stocks. This is work that's come from Ray
11 Hillborn's group that has actually shown that there's been
12 quite a bit of stability when you look at the stock assessment
13 data on the major stocks at least 40 percent of the stocks.
14 And 40 percent of the stocks more or less represents what's
15 traded. There's a larger percent of the stocks, which are
16 kind of intercontinental, that doesn't really travel as much
17 as others.

18 And there have been a lot of cases of misuse of
19 terminology: "overfishing," "overfished," "overexploited."
20 And what our group has found is that just because something is
21 overfished doesn't mean it's necessarily unsustainable.
22 What's more important is the status of a management system
23 itself. Is the management system in place that can account
24 for changes in stock status or fishing level? That's much

1 more important than a picture of where a stock is at any given
2 point in time. And that's a theme that has been carried
3 throughout three different workshops that we've been involved
4 in. So, looking at management systems is kind of a natural
5 outcome from our science and sustainability process.

6 In 2012, we began a project with funding support
7 from the Gulf State and Marine Fisheries Commission to look at
8 the management system on our Magnuson-Stevens Act and similar
9 state management programs in the Gulf of Mexico.

10 You know, as well as I do, and you've all heard
11 NOAA has repeated this many times that fisheries managed
12 under MSA are sustainable. But what NOAA hasn't really done
13 is to provide a program that documents its sustainability and
14 distinguish U.S.-managed seafood products in the marketplace.
15 And that's one of the discussions that we're really talking
16 about. So, we began a project to actually benchmark the MSA,
17 NOAA, state system in the Gulf of Mexico region using the FAO
18 eco-labeling guidelines for sustainable fisheries. And, as a
19 matter of fact, in 2010, FAO itself, through an expert
20 consultation process, established an evaluation framework to
21 do this assessment to assess the conformance of eco-labeling
22 programs for sustainability.

23 Now, we're applying it to management systems, and
24 our objective is to basically evaluate both the management and

1 stock assessment process compared with the FAO guidelines;
2 identify gaps that might exist with those guidelines; and then
3 develop some recommendations for consideration by NOAA and
4 state managers. It does not necessarily have to go to
5 Congress; it could be implemented voluntarily.

6 Our partners are the Gulf States Marine Fisheries
7 Commission. This is a case study. And we've had a good
8 relationship within the NOAA Office of Domestic Fisheries.
9 And I want to recognize another Knauss Fellow, Dr. Walsh, who
10 Galen allowed to work on this project, and it's been a great
11 project so far. We've got a lot more work to do. So, a
12 little plug for Knauss Fellows there.

13 The criteria that we're using come from FAO. It's
14 quite extensive. I'm not going to go through all the
15 different criteria. There are 25 different categories. They
16 fall within three major headings that look at the management
17 system itself, that look at the stocks and the status of the
18 stocks, and then look at the ecosystem impacts. Those are the
19 three general areas that FAO has always looked at and
20 categorized the more specific criteria, which are outlined
21 below.

22 We have an evaluation guideline that also comes from
23 the FAO benchmarking tool. They identify three types of
24 evidence to look at:

1 Internal evidence. In other words, somewhere in a
2 nation or a state there is a criteria that's written, and
3 within the Magnuson Act it's the 10 standards we will do
4 this; we will not do this. And we're now going through the
5 process of looking at state statutes to see what they have to
6 say. There are some states that say, well, we're going to not
7 have overfished fisheries, or whatever the standard might be.
8 So, the first is has the government agency made this a
9 priority?

10 The second is that there's some outcome evidence.
11 In other words, the state or the management agency's actually
12 been applying this standard in some systematic way. It can be
13 documented or tracked. And of course you're familiar with how
14 NOAA attracts the status of different fisheries, whether
15 they're overfished, not overfished, where everything is. So,
16 there's outcome evidence.

17 And then, finally, there's independence evidence,
18 and that's where a third party has come in to make an
19 evaluation about that management system. That could have been
20 MSC; GAA; Global Trust; or Center for Independent Experts,
21 which reviews all the stock assessments in the United States.

22 For visual purposes, we use the star system, and a
23 black star indicates strong evidence across all fisheries and
24 all jurisdictions for particular criteria, where a white star

1 might indicate conformance in some but maybe not others. And
2 so if there's a white star, it means it's being complied with
3 but maybe not in all fisheries and there's some area for
4 improvement. That's kind of a visual tool.

5 The structure of the evaluation. We actually go
6 through every FAO guideline that I identified in a previous
7 slide and lay it out. We look at the guidelines, the
8 regulations, the statutes. We go through a discussion of the
9 different types of evidence; highlight it with examples of the
10 stocks that might apply for that particular guideline; and
11 then come to some conclusions of whether there's conformance
12 or whether there's a gap and then end up with some
13 recommendations.

14 So, just an example of how our process is
15 proceeding. And, as I said, we've been doing this we're
16 about a year into the project.

17 So, identify the requirement; discuss it; identify
18 the statutes in place in this case I think I pulled out the
19 statutes that address overfishing and optimum yield have a
20 process where we can include some discussion of evidence and
21 conclusions; and then we have a table that if you went by the
22 posters you may have seen our poster during the conference the
23 last three days, which had a large summary table.

1 Now, this is a little different. It's a little
2 different from other sort of assessments that have been going
3 on. And, as I said, we're looking at states; we're looking
4 regional structures, the commissions, the councils, all of
5 which already do follow many of the standards for
6 sustainability. And we're a little different also. And I
7 want to go back to the HACCP example, because we're not
8 looking at a fishery-by-fishery assessment process, we're
9 looking at a systems assessment process. We want to evaluate
10 the management system and its ability to address the criteria
11 established by FAO. So, what is our objective? It's to
12 integrate the FAO sustainability criteria into the existing
13 system for the management and assessment process and present a
14 fishery management system assessment rather than a fishery-by-
15 fishery assessment.

16 The feeling's always been that we can achieve some
17 efficiencies of scale and reduce some costs and expenditures
18 by integrating this into one process instead of doing this
19 after a plan has already gone through Magnuson. Then its
20 assessment and management evaluation is kind of it goes
21 through a third party. Why don't we just incorporate this
22 into the existing process that we have. And I think we can
23 perhaps achieve some economies of scale and still get the same
24 end result.

1 FAO identified some potential uses for its
2 evaluation framework, and they have to do with providing an
3 assessment in relationship to the biological sustainability
4 component of a system. It can be used as a self-assessment
5 tool to kind of improve state and federal management and as a
6 tool to assess the conformity of a program with the eco-
7 labeling guidelines from FAO. And of course from their
8 perspective, this could be done by governments, consumers,
9 retailers, whoever has an interest in doing it. We think
10 there's some potential outcomes that would be beneficial,
11 again, like the systems approach as opposed to the fisheries
12 by fisheries approach so that if a system can address all this
13 criteria once a plan goes through a management system process,
14 then, theoretically, all its fisheries should be compliant
15 with the FAO criteria.

16 And so this could potentially provide some basis for
17 market recognition, and it still will involve some sort of a
18 third-party certification of the process. So, we're not
19 trying to jump over that aspect and maintain some sort of a
20 third-party evaluation process, but we're just trying to seek
21 some efficiencies.

22 What are our timelines? We have a group from FAO,
23 some of the individuals that have recently retired that are
24 helping us evaluate our project to make sure that we're being

1 consistent with FAO and their benchmarking process. We'll be
2 presenting our first state evaluation in June to Louisiana.
3 We'll be working in the southeast region and the other states
4 throughout the remainder of the year. We've got some
5 presentations going on. This year we expect to have a
6 workshop with our clients, Gulf States Marine Fisheries
7 Commission, sometime this year, and hopefully we'll continue
8 this dialogue next year at a gulf sustainability forum. We do
9 want to continue to interact and discuss the project with FAO,
10 because we're using an evaluation framework that came from
11 their subcommittee on fisheries trade.

12 So, we think it's very timely, particularly because
13 of the motions coming from the councils, that there's really
14 an interest to try to provide some sort of a documented
15 procedure whereby plans going through the MSA process can be
16 recognized as sustainable.

17 Conclusions that we've come to so far from the
18 initial work are that NOAA fisheries and the Gulf of Fishery
19 Management Systems that we've evaluated to date are largely in
20 conformance with FAO's guidelines for seafood product eco-
21 labeling based on the three types of evidence to assess
22 conformance that I discussed; and, second, that we view this
23 exercise as a significant step in improving fishery management

1 systems and providing a process to systematically document the
2 sustainability of our fisheries in the United States.

3 That's enough to hopefully start some discussion, so
4 I'll pass the putter on to Laurel.

5 MR. NARDI: Thank you, Thor. Laurel, thank you.
6 Just a quick question for clarification, Thor.

7 MR. LASSEN: Yes.

8 MS. DOERR: Very quick. So, what you're doing with
9 Louisiana and the Gulf of Mexico is the outcome a new
10 certification for them, or is it just more of an assessment
11 and information to get a sense of where those states lie
12 within the FAO framework?

13 MR. LASSEN: It's an assessment of their management
14 system.

15 MR. NARDI: Would you turn your mic on, sir?

16 MR. LASSEN: Yes. It's an assessment of their
17 management system and their management system's conformance to
18 FAO criteria. The objective is to evaluate whether they are
19 in conformance or whether there are gaps. If there are gaps,
20 we will report them back to the states for their
21 consideration. I can tell you that Louisiana is already
22 making changes in how they develop their management plans so
23 that they are integrating the FAO standards into their
24 management planning process.

1 MS. DOERR: By giving them a label?

2 MR. LASSEN: The label my opinion is that a label
3 is not necessary. I think that some sort of a market
4 distinction or market recognition as opposed to everyone
5 keeps talking about a label, because most labeling the trends
6 in labeling are for stores to promote their own label, and a
7 lot more companies are doing trade packing, and if you go to a
8 grocery store, you're going to see Safeway's label, Harris
9 Teeter's label. You're not going to see branding, and we're
10 not trying to do any branding there. We're trying to provide
11 some assurance to seafood buyers and consumers that, in fact,
12 this fish comes from a sustainable program. So, that's what
13 our end goal is.

14 MR. NARDI: All set? Thanks, Laurel.

15 **FishWatch Marketing and Partnerships**

16 MS. BRYANT: Okay, I moved down here so I can see
17 people. I'm not good at sitting down. Many of you who know
18 me know that, but we're going to work this.

19 I want to say just a few words to kind of put this
20 in context and to thank Mark and Keith and George for
21 including this.

22 I first want to as we deal with climate change and
23 adaptability I think we're all doing very well.

1 So we'll see if we can see the PowerPoint. But I do
2 want to give some recognition in this room to some of my
3 colleagues who have really made this possible in terms of
4 FishWatch moving forward. I want to give a shout out to the
5 communications director, Kate Naughton, who's with us; also
6 the deputy of our communications shop, Rebecca Thorough; and
7 the Sustainable Fisheries Division recently got an outreach
8 person. Her name is Darcie Honabarger. She has been working
9 with me on FishWatch now for a number of months as we
10 integrate and move it forward. And then we have Bill Zander
11 here who's with our exhibits program. Between us, you're
12 looking at about almost four-fifths of the communication
13 horsepower in our headquarters, so you've got us all. I
14 encourage you to talk with us.

15 I'm going to give out one last shout out
16 recognition. There's a young lady sitting in the back named
17 Katie Semon, who is my partner in crime in really getting
18 FishWatch launched. She did a lot of the sweat and blood in
19 drafting and getting the content pulled together from eight
20 sight centers, eight regional offices, and all clearances. It
21 was yeoman's work to get that thing launched.

22 We launched in 2012. That wasn't that long ago a
23 little more than 14 months ago. We are not a public agency,
24 as you know. We're a science-based agency. And we, too, have

1 been working through the process of increasing communication.
2 We've heard that for a long time. The office that I just
3 mentioned to you is maybe just 24 months young, and FishWatch
4 was one of our biggest products that we knew we would really
5 have an opportunity to interface with the public. So, it's
6 only been out there a little longer than 14 months. We have
7 only just begun a marketing program, but as of this February
8 we are proud announce that Forbes magazine actually listed us
9 as one of the top 10 food websites to go to, and that made our
10 website traffic jump by about 60,000 visits in one month. So,
11 we feel like we've got something and we're working it.

12 What you're going to see today I'm going to have
13 Rebecca cue it up to start it off, but I want to put this in
14 context for you. What this is, is kind of a Fish 101 slide
15 deck as we start our marketing. And so you are all very savvy
16 and experienced in fisheries. There's going to be a lot of
17 information here you know. Just know that the people that I'm
18 presenting this to I did this for the very first time just
19 two weeks ago when I was on a panel with MSC and GAA Molly
20 actually was there targeting a lot of those big retailers,
21 those big providers, those Sodexos. It was High Liner that
22 had actually invited me. These people are not aware of what
23 NOAA Fisheries is and what it does, let alone how well managed
24 NOAA Fisheries is or how well managed you, as fisheries, are.

1 So, as we walk through this PowerPoint, I want you to kind of
2 put your hat on that you are not the savvy experts you are,
3 and we'll see how it hits you, and I welcome, as we all do
4 here in the Communications Office, any thoughts or suggestions
5 you have.

6 Rebecca, why don't you tee up the video.

7 (Video shown)

8 MS. BRYANT: Okay, so I just want to let everybody
9 know that that is actually online on the FishWatch website,
10 and we just put it there a couple of weeks ago, so it hasn't
11 been up there very long, and it was our own Bill Zander's
12 voice on that, so it's very much a homespun product.

13 So, as I walk you through, the three things that I want you to
14 remember in terms of messages and understanding U.S. fisheries
15 is, one, that sustainability is a dynamic process. It's not a
16 static data point. It's not a red/yellow/green. It is
17 constantly changing and evolving. We've heard a lot of
18 discussions about the MSA and how it continues to evolve to meet
19 those challenges. And NOAA Fisheries has been doing this for a
20 long time, and we've still got a long way to go in terms of that
21 evolution and new challenges ahead.

22 I wanted to say a little bit about NOAA and what NOAA is. NASA
23 may send up all the satellites, but it is NOAA that pretty much
24 manages the data streams regarding the information on the earth.

1 And just like the weather service does the weather, and we have
2 folks doing the ocean, NOAA Fisheries is the one that is
3 monitoring and generating the data stream and maintaining it for
4 fisheries and living marine resources within the ocean, not just
5 within our own EEZ but also beyond and in international waters
6 with regard to regional fishery management organizations and
7 influencing those international stewardship processes.

8 The origin of NOAA Fisheries and I just kind of put this in
9 there a little anecdotally, because I don't know if everybody
10 understands we're actually the oldest and first federal agency
11 dedicated to natural resource conservation. Our origins are
12 with the Smithsonian Institution at the Natural History Museum,
13 and that relationship continues today. We still have the
14 Memorandum of Agreement and Understanding with our science
15 centers and the Smithsonian, and that's why the United States is
16 owner and keeper of the largest fisheries collection in the
17 world.

18 So, I wanted to point out some pivotal dates in terms of our
19 management. Prior to 1976, international waters began just 12
20 miles off our shore, and pretty much fisheries management was
21 conducted by the State Department in terms of selling leases to
22 foreign governments who are able to come in without management
23 and oversight. And as a result, we ended up with a lot of
24 depleted resources.

1 In 1976, a very visionary law, now known as the Magnuson-Stevens
2 Act, was passed, and that extended U.S. Waters out to 200 miles.
3 It was known as the Fisheries Conservation Zone at that time.
4 We all now have come to know that as the Exclusive Economic
5 Zone, which was done by presidential proclamation in 1983.
6 But that changed everything, and one of the more visionary
7 aspects of the Magnuson-Stevens Act was its regional approach to
8 managing fisheries, a true beginning and a cornerstone of
9 public/private partnership in managing natural resources. That
10 partnership has continued to evolve. It did not get established
11 and come with instructions on how to do it quickly and right.
12 It took a while to set that process up and set up the science
13 backing that it had. But it did move forward. During that
14 period of time while it was setting up, though, technology was
15 advancing very rapidly. And the fishing technology advanced.
16 We were able to harvest very efficiently, and we had some big
17 boom-bust fisheries that were going on, and pretty much by the
18 '80s we were looking at our fisheries declining around the
19 country, and I think everybody remembers those dates in 1992
20 when the codfish stock off Nova Scotia was officially collapsed.
21 In 1996, we started to see a change in fisheries, and this is
22 where the Act obtains the next visionary beyond Senator Magnuson
23 from Washington State, and that is Senator Stevens from Alaska.
24 Senator Stevens stepped up to the plate, and his vision was

1 really pulling in some of those international aspects that had
2 not previously been involved before. He also started to
3 recognize some additional things, like essential fish habitat;
4 looking at some more ecosystem fundamental components.
5 So, in 1996 you start to see the emergence of national standards
6 looking at ending overfishing; looking at communities; looking
7 at by-catch; looking at habitat. But the real game changer came
8 in 2007 2006/2007 with the most recent reauthorization. And
9 Senator Stevens was very critical to that process as well. The
10 game changer came by really putting teeth into it, and that was
11 putting in annual catch limits with accountability measures,
12 meaning, every fishery managed by the United States by the end
13 of the 2012 fishing season would have an annual catch limit that
14 it needed to operate under, and it would be held accountable to
15 that limit.

16 I wanted to just give you a sense of the scope of U.S.
17 fisheries. We are the largest in the world. We have over 11.4
18 million square kilometers that we are responsible for in our
19 waters. That does not include what we influence, what we
20 monitor, the science cooperative involvement that we have with
21 other nations, and the influence that we do try with our
22 partners, many of which are around this table, as well as the
23 regional fishery organizations around the world.

1 So, how are we sizing up? We're pretty good. This came
2 from an article out of Nature in 2000, and it looked at the
3 compliance of fishery laws across some of the major fishing
4 nations in the world, and we are second only to Norway. We
5 also are colossal in terms of our size compared to the
6 fisheries that Norway is involved with, and without trying to
7 offend anybody at the table, I would point out that they do
8 like to wale. Just putting that out there. (Laughter) So, let
9 me just point out what we at NOAA Fisheries and what I think
10 many of our partners around the table have worked very hard to
11 establish as the three pillars for U.S. fisheries management.
12 The backbone is science. There's no question. We would not be
13 anything if we did not have science.
14 I would kind of say the nervous system, if you want to look at
15 it that way that's your management, and it's different. The
16 hands operate different from the feet. There are your regions;
17 there are those unique differences and unique ecosystems and
18 many, many eyes and views and cultures and economies on the
19 water. And the muscle is your enforcement. I think that's
20 something that we need to stand out in this country or be a
21 little bit different, even in the E.U. They don't have a coast
22 guard that they get to go to. They don't have states that are
23 all working together under a compliance of the national law. We
24 have many joint enforcement actions with all of our state

1 partners, our state partners represented around this advisory
2 body here with the commissions. We also have the Coast Guard
3 that is very involved in helping enforce our laws. And we have
4 this cooperative research with Interpol that we are continually
5 trying to strengthen and work with on, and particularly in
6 prioritizing IUU and finding those vessels and identifying them.
7 Let me just say briefly about the 10 national standards that you
8 heard mentioned in both the video and from myself earlier, these
9 10 national standards, if you really think about it and you look
10 at them, are listed on the website and explained in much more
11 detail. But there are three comprising elements. They are both
12 biological in terms of the health of the population; they are
13 ecological in terms of the marine environment, whether that's
14 habitat impact, by-catch reduction, and those concerned; and
15 they also embrace the socio-economic aspects of sustainability.
16 Kind of look at those as the three-legged stool, and if you
17 don't have all three you will not have something that you can
18 sustain. And I put an emphasis and a highlight on that
19 socioeconomic aspect.

20 We have really been in a process in this country of overcoming,
21 overfishing, and ending it and preventing it and rebuilding. We
22 know how to do that now. We have those tools. We have those
23 relationships with our fishermen where kind of that next step is
24 really building much more of an underscore of the socio-

1 economies and bringing that human aspect. We've been very good
2 on the punitive side of the equation at this point. We need to
3 get a little bit better about the reward side.

4 This is probably the cornerstone. This is the buzzword of NOAA
5 Fisheries if you hear it anywhere: "science-based management."
6 And I want to put just a little bit of a reality check on that
7 for you. What science-based management means is preventing
8 overfishing up front. But overfishing will always occur at some
9 point somewhere. There are natural changes in ecosystems, there
10 are natural abundancies changes in populations. There is a
11 variety of things. We have some nasty things on the horizon
12 called "climate change" and "ocean acidification" that are going
13 to complicate this.

14 So, monitoring is essential. In monitoring, this is where
15 you're really getting into those annual catch limits and the
16 stock assessments. Those are the eyes that are really looking
17 at are those annual catch limits working? And are we able to
18 follow them? Are they realistic? What do we need to tweak?
19 And then there are accountability measures.

20 This is a system that's still evolving. This is what we've
21 worked, now, since 2007, and it's going to be reevaluated. It
22 always needs to be, because things are always changing, and we
23 can improve on it and refine it. And these are the national
24 discussions that are going to be occurring throughout your

1 regions, and many of your representatives at the state and
2 industry levels will be engaged in this conversation over the
3 next couple of years.

4 So, how are we doing? The overfished species? We still have
5 some. And what's interesting on this map is that each one of
6 the ones that are here tell a little bit of a different story.
7 Now, we have an overfished species up in Alaska that you will
8 see. It's called "overfished," but it but really doesn't have
9 anything to do with fishermen overfishing actively. We think
10 this is clearly an ecosystem issue. And there are actually
11 discussions to change the term "overfishing" or "overfished,"
12 because overfished, or a depleted, a lower biomass, if you will,
13 is not always the result of overfishing, particularly as we get
14 better and better at preventing active overfishing and
15 rebuilding. There are other causes to it.

16 There are other areas where you've got up in New England, for
17 instance the oldest fisheries in the country. It's been going
18 on for 400 years. They're incredibly exploited. You have a
19 very, very different socio-economy up there. Things are taking
20 longer up there.

21 And then you have various grades around the country. They're
22 all in different periods of rebuilding. There are some stocks
23 that are going to rebuild faster than others, anywhere from 32
24 years on the West Coast to terms of

1 and 60 years over in New England. But let's take a look at the
2 good picture, and that is since 2000 we have officially rebuilt
3 32 stocks and counting. So, the process clearly works. The
4 process will only continue to work if we continue to work with
5 it and the changing and adaptive tools that we're going to need.
6 So, we're going to kind of focus on the return of investment and
7 what we've gotten so far and what this means to the economy. In
8 this one, I've really focused on the seafood side of things.
9 This does not reflect the recreational fishery side of things.
10 This is intended to be a food source phase. But 129 billion in
11 sales impacts, billion in income impacts, and 1.2 million jobs.
12 The thing that NOAA Fisheries is proud to point out is that in
13 the last number of years of economic downturn, this has actually
14 been a job sector that's been improving, and it's not, maybe, a
15 sector that's been improving only in terms of jobs but, almost
16 more importantly, in value.

17 I think one of my favorite examples in fisheries management is
18 occurring over on the West Coast Groundfish fishery in which you
19 have a very complex fishery of over a hundred stocks, five of
20 which are endangered. You have an enormous, complex process
21 that has taken 8 to 10 years to develop working with fishermen
22 in the community, providing catchers and quotas that in the very
23 first year of operation the by-catch of those species that you
24 don't want to target that are in desperate need of rebuilding

1 have dropped from 75 to 94 percent, depending upon the species,
2 whereas the value of the catch for those fishermen has increased
3 by 47 percent. I think this is only a hint of what we have on
4 the horizon.

5 So, some of these point out the real challenges that we're
6 dealing with, that no amount of controlling fishing effort is
7 going to address, and these are much more thorny; they're much
8 more difficult; and this is what really brings in the science
9 and the monitoring and the cooperation and the partnerships that
10 we're going to continue to evolve in the years ahead.

11 So, here are some things that I think set up fisheries
12 management, and let us move into some of the broader portfolio
13 that we'll be looking at in terms of sustainable seafood. And
14 that is about 90 percent right now, depending upon how you slice
15 and dice it.

16 The U.S seafood consumption is being imported. Sixty percent of
17 that is farm raised. Unfortunately, very little of that is
18 domestically produced. And the world is changing, and if we're
19 going to have sustainable supplies of source seafood, we're
20 going to need a healthy, vibrant aquaculture that helps
21 supplement and build that.

22 The seafood demand is only going to go up (inaudible) 7 billion
23 people coming and to be able to have not only the high-end value
24 of wild capture fisheries but also those very stable sources of

1 secure, safe, very traceable seafood, I might add, with a much
2 lower carbon footprint is aquaculture. And so you're going to
3 see in FishWatch that this is kind of a new area that we're
4 developing and putting a face and part of that portfolio in
5 sustainable fisheries for the United States.

6 So, this is just a little bit on what FishWatch is and what it's
7 not. It is not an eco-label, and it is not a certification
8 process. We occupy some very unique real estate out there in
9 the industry, (inaudible) idea and that is the database.

10 What we've tried to do with FishWatch, realizing that we are not
11 a communications or public relations firm we are a sciences-
12 based agency we have a really good story to tell, and we've not
13 told it, and we are responsible for much of the databases that
14 these folks pull their data from. Whether it's an eco-label,
15 whether it's a ranking system, whether it's an information-based
16 system like FishChoice or FishWise, it starts in premise on NOAA
17 Fishery's database, and what NOAA Fisheries' FishWatch program
18 is trying to do is give a face to that very dynamic science-
19 based process, the science behind the seafood.

20 So, let me just walk you through about three pages of what
21 FishWatch is and some new things that we're adding. As I said,
22 we've only had it out there for little more than 8 months, and
23 then at this last Boston Seafood show in 2013, we've added a few
24 more bells and whistles. We're proud to say we have actually

1 added some aquaculture pages. We also added a toolbox an
2 outreach toolbox.

3 It's pretty simple right now, but what you'll find on there is a
4 copy of the video, if you want it; you'll find a copy of a
5 webpage badge, if you want to be able to put and link directly
6 to FishWatch. This is going to be something I'll speak to a
7 little bit about and where we're going to take FishWatch in
8 terms of a partnership program, working with partners even
9 around the table. But we intend to go to that toolbox,
10 including maybe even an educational curriculum that we have
11 approached, the NOAA Office of Education working with Galen's
12 group, and so forth. It's still in an idea phase, but it's
13 there.

14 The seafood news. We try to change this and switch this up
15 weekly. I will point out that Louisiana stole Katie Semon from
16 us. And since they did, we're updating this about twice a week
17 where some of our young hired contracted guns up there in Silver
18 Spring to keep this up to date and comb through the news every
19 week, and we kind of let them know what to put up there. So,
20 that gets updated two or three times a week.

21 Sustainability facts is an area that we look at as growth.
22 We're really starting to reach out across our programs in terms
23 of getting those frequently asked questions where we can
24 highlight maybe we can demystify; maybe we can provide some

1 answers. We think this is an area of growth and information
2 that we've only just begun to tap.

3 And then the science behind the seafood is an area that we're
4 starting to have more and more fun with. Kate and Rebecca were
5 very keen. They were able to get a science writer on our staff.
6 You will begin to see much more user friendly and story
7 information about our science, how it connects to seafood; and
8 we'll be featuring these things. We're repurposing a lot
9 through our website, but this is a way to get to that.

10 And then the rotator. There you can see the video. That'll
11 stay up there. But we have about four different rotating
12 stories that we're trying to keep refreshed throughout the month
13 on the front page of FishWatch.

14 I just wanted to throw this up there a little bit of the
15 narrative that I gave you. You will find that in here. You
16 will also find information on I should go back. I don't know
17 if I can go back. I will go back. I meant to point out the
18 Fish Finder. So, the Fish Finder, that's where you're going to
19 find your seafood profiles, and we have over a hundred species
20 now that are listed. And I have a slide just a little bit
21 ahead. We can walk through that.

22 The buying of seafood. Little more of a seafood approach to it
23 as a consumer, but we actually even provide the nutritional
24 information for each and every species that's profiled on here.

1 Here's one of the species profile pages. We have borrowed from
2 what others have developed in the marketplace for consumers and
3 borrowed from that navigation that's become very friendly and
4 familiar to the consumers. And that is population, which is
5 your biomass, the fishing reg which is overfishing or no
6 overfishing habitat impacts, as well as by-catch impact.
7 This does remind me that our goal is really not to communicate
8 to the consumer. We're not ever going to be able to do that.
9 We're not good at that. We don't have the budget for it, and I
10 think it would be a waste of our resources. So, our target
11 really is that supply chain, of looking at those that supply
12 seafood, and working with those that are also on the information
13 chain.
14 I'm just going to throw this up here. Here's one of our new
15 aquaculture pages. And you'll see that we've kind of borrowed
16 from some of the familiar navigation that you'll see but changed
17 and switched about to be more appropriate to cultured species as
18 opposed to wild capture.
19 So, some of the future initiatives that we have: We're
20 certainly going to continue to add species. We are in the
21 process internally to develop an integrated way of doing that.
22 We've got an annual operating plan that we're putting together
23 and identifying those species that we'll be adding each year.

1 We also want to start adding value. We realize it is the
2 digital age. Everybody wants an app, an app, an app. Those are
3 very expensive, and there's a lot of content. Again, this is a
4 day of scarcity, and we're going to be looking at it ahead. So,
5 we are looking at some other alternatives that can make it
6 easier for, like, the responsive design, whether it's on your
7 iPhone or your PC. But we are looking at those actively.
8 And then gaining support, and this is where I'll kind of jump
9 off and close up, and that is looking at NOAA Fisheries, we're
10 in the process right now of exploring a possible partnership
11 program. Rebecca has really brought this. We brought this to
12 Paul and our leadership toward the end of last fiscal year.
13 They've asked us to proceed and explore that with a third party,
14 to go out and explore with some of the big buyers, the big
15 producers, and the big suppliers in terms of would this be of
16 value. And a partnership program essentially would be
17 identifying categories of partnerships that would link to
18 FishWatch, that would identify NOAA Fisheries as an authority
19 and as the nation's database and acknowledge that source of
20 information. And based on whether it's a fisherman, is it a
21 retailer, or is it even an aquarium Monterey Bay, for instance,
22 various different levels of category and recognition? We look
23 at this as an opportunity to expand and amplify the message

1 about U.S. fisheries, and that's something that we're absolutely
2 dedicated for and why we think FishWatch will be a helpful tool.
3 And I think this is my last slide on just a little bit that
4 we've had some fun recently in terms of some of our success. I
5 just wanted to give a shout out to a chef in California who has
6 actually begun to print the FishWatch on a QR code on edible
7 rice paper that he serves on top of each piece of sushi in his
8 restaurant. So, the sky is limit, boys and girls. We've only
9 just begun.

10 I just want to leave you with four thoughts about U.S. fisheries
11 and NOAA's involvement in that. We're a founding partner in
12 sustainable seafood and sustainable fisheries. We are a global
13 leader and an innovator, and we really are a trusted authority,
14 and that's what we are seeking in terms of gaining the trust of
15 the public for our science-based management program and our U.S.
16 fisheries.

17 And thank you very much.

18 MR. NARDI: Thank you, Laurel, and thank you Kerry,
19 Thor, and Molly for the information presentations. I know I
20 did learn some things, and I'm sure many of us did.

21 **MAVAC/Panel Discussion**

22 MR. NARDI: On the agenda, and we're not doing too
23 bad for time, we are going to now have an open panel
24 discussion, and I think before we come to the MAVAC group and

1 their questions, which we'll have plenty of time for I hope,
2 I'd like to open it up we have some guests that have come to
3 provide 10 minutes or so, Keith? Would that be acceptable?

4 MR. RIZZARDI: Yeah. What I was thinking is
5 recognizing we do have some people here, could I just get a
6 show of hands of folks who would like an opportunity to
7 address us for two or three minutes? We're just trying to
8 make sure that we're informed and get enough feedback. One,
9 two, three, four, five, six -- six folks, yeah. I mean, we'd
10 love to hear from you, too, if you can come on up and
11 introduce yourself and give us two or three minutes.

12 Mark, did you want to comment? So, we'll ask that
13 you keep the comment short and allow us the opportunity to
14 talk with the panelists.

15 MR. RIUTTA: Hello, I'm Ray Riutta, the Alaska
16 Seafood Marketing Institute or at least I was. I'm retired
17 but recalled to active duty for a week while they're busy at a
18 board meeting.

19 I would like to echo something that Stephanie Matson
20 said this morning, I believe, about spending money on eco-
21 logos, and I

22 MR. NARDI: Sir, could you slide the mic a little
23 closer.

1 MR. RIUTTA: Sorry, sorry. My voice is a little
2 it's been a long like all the rest of you. Can you hear me
3 now? That's a good advertisement.

4 I'd like to just echo something that Stephanie said
5 this morning about spending money on eco-logos. The first
6 thing I would agree with I think Kerry made some really good
7 points in there on the issues you're going to have if you go
8 in and try to do an eco-logo from NOAA. I think it's very
9 expensive. I'm not sure that for U.S. Fisheries, particularly
10 those that sell in the U.S., that it's worth spending a lot of
11 money on eco-logos.

12 I think if I can just make a quick detour, how did
13 eco-logos come about? They came about because of abject
14 failure in the European common fisheries policy, and this is
15 not the way we manage our fisheries here. So, applying an
16 eco-logo to a U.S. fishery should only be done when it is
17 absolutely necessary to use in a marketplace. We have been
18 through this with our customer advisory panels. I think here
19 Roger Bing and those of you that were in our meeting yesterday
20 say that the customer really isn't interested in this. This
21 is a B2B deal, a business-to-business deal, and that's where
22 the decision on whether you should have an eco-logo or not
23 needs to be made. It's really not something that can be

1 provided by government. You'll run into all kinds of problems
2 and it will be very expensive.

3 I can speak from experience. It's really a
4 challenge.

5 The other thing is that you have a great story to
6 tell here. I think what Laurel's doing with FishWatch is
7 really good, and what Thor just talked about with the overview
8 of U.S. fisheries against the FAO code is also something
9 that's really powerful. What the customers that we deal with
10 and we bring our major buyers in to sit down and talk to us
11 and ask them what they want they basically say: We want a
12 background assurance, because it's our logo that we want to
13 put out there, our brand. We don't want a bunch of logos on
14 our packages. And, well, I think this is a personal opinion
15 I think eco-logos served a purpose for the last 8 to 10 years.
16 I think we're moving it to a new environment where for well-
17 managed fisheries like ours there really isn't going to be a
18 need or even a desire for eco-logos. But if there is, that's
19 something that the marketplace has to sort out, and that's a
20 business-to-business thing. You really don't want to get into
21 that business and divert NOAA's precious money into spending
22 on eco-logos. They are, like I say, very expensive.

23 Okay.

24 MR. NARDI: Thank you.

1 MR. KAELYN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good
2 afternoon, members of the MAFAC. I'm Jeff Kaelyn. I work
3 with Lund's Fisheries in Cape May, New Jersey. I've been in
4 the commercial fishing industry since 1972.

5 Lund's is a vertically integrated family-owned
6 company. I don't think there's a country in the world that we
7 haven't sold product in over the last, well, 30 or 40 years.
8 We do operate in the E.U., and we are convinced that a U.S.
9 certification label is something that we need and that we can
10 use in the E.U. and domestically as well.

11 We're concerned that the MSC label might become an
12 E.U. trade barrier. I was in the sardine industry for a long
13 time. They're very good at erecting trade barriers in the
14 European Union against our product. So, over the years we've
15 become convinced we need an alternative to MSC. We are
16 participating in an MSC evaluation in the sea scallop
17 industry, because we feel we've been forced into it. Canada
18 went that way. The E.U. wants it now. We do not see it as a
19 viable long-term position for us to be in. We use FishWatch
20 with local consumers things like HarborFest in Cape May.

21 Consumers are very savvy, and they're very confused.
22 But when they're told that the United States government is
23 doing the job and we show them FishWatch, they love it.
24 They're convinced that that's good enough. They're not

1 looking for ENGOs to come in and say the United States
2 government is doing the job. Like the fact that we are doing
3 the job here. So, we're using FishWatch with consumers.
4 We're using FishWatch with the supermarket suppliers that buy
5 from us in the United States. And we have been working with
6 the councils to get council support and commission support for
7 the idea that we do a certification program as part of the
8 Magnuson Act reauthorization. If there's a cost, let's make
9 it fee based. We're convinced it will cost us less money to
10 have a program that builds on FishWatch and take a mark around
11 the world. This is not a domestic issue; this is a worldwide
12 issue. Let us compete against MSC, and we will be successful
13 in selling sustainable seafood products in the United States
14 and around the world. And that's where we're coming from.

15 And I really appreciate the opportunity to say a few
16 words before I get in the car and go to Lewis, Delaware, and
17 get on the ferry, because we've all been all week, but thank
18 you for considering that perspective, and I look forward to
19 working with you guys on that. Thank you very much.

20 MR. RIZZARDI: Thank you.

21 MR. MARKS: Thanks, Keith. Hey, folks, I know it's
22 been a long day. My name's Rick Marks. I represent domestic
23 fishermen and seafood processors in just about every region in
24 the country. And what I have noticed lately, in the last year

1 or so, is more of these folks have been coming to me and
2 asking if there's any way for us to get some sort of
3 certification that helps us domestically. And I think some of
4 the origin of that is that these fishermen go to markets and
5 they see the ENGO labels that have their fisheries on the do-
6 not-eat list just because they might use a particular kind of
7 gear, and I think that they've struggling under that scenario.
8 So, we don't want to complicate the system with more labels
9 and have things look like NASCAR. We understand that, but we
10 also understand we heard all week how hard we've all been
11 working and been successful under the Magnuson Act that we
12 should stand tall and embrace that success. So, we're hopeful
13 that we can find some way to find a very simple approach,
14 something along the lines of a "packed under federal
15 inspection" type of label or mark, that some of the 2000
16 seafood buyers may be willing to gravitate away from the eco-
17 labels more toward a federal mark and then purchase seafood
18 that way, and then the consumer will have access to it instead
19 of being subject to some sort of grading system that's
20 subjective.

21 So, we're hopeful for you to look at this and
22 recommend a simple approach that embraces the Magnuson Act
23 standards and supports some of the efforts that the domestic
24 industry's been taking.

1 I appreciate the time. I know, again, it's been a
2 long day. Thank you, Chairman.

3 MR. WHITESIDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good
4 afternoon. My name is John Whiteside. I'm an attorney in New
5 Bedford, Massachusetts. I represent the American Scallop
6 Association and the Sustainable Fisheries Association and a
7 number of other processors in the ancillary businesses from
8 Maine to North Carolina, all involved in seafood in one form
9 or another.

10 The Sustainable Fisheries Association received MSC
11 certification for the Spiny Dogfish Fishery back on August
12 30th of this last year, and the American Scallop Association
13 is in the final stages and hopefully we will secure that
14 certification in the next couple of months. Both associations
15 engaged in that process as a way of maintaining share and
16 maintaining access to markets in the E.U., Canada, and certain
17 markets in the U.S., and that is the primary impetus for that.

18 There are companies global companies retailers who
19 make MSC certification a prerequisite to sell them product,
20 and that's why we're in. I can say, without any hesitation at
21 all, that my clients are huge supporters of FishWatch, and we
22 think that Laurel and team do a fantastic job, and we are
23 constantly driving our clients and customers to FishWatch as
24 the primary source for the data that are being used by any

1 number of eco-labels that are out there, and that's just
2 piggybacking on what NOAA does for work, and we support and
3 vocally advocate for more resources being put to FishWatch and
4 developing that more. And the video that was shown today is
5 an excellent presentation on what is going on.

6 I really have just the highest respect for the work
7 that's done all throughout NOAA, and I welcome the opportunity
8 to speak today, and thank you very much.

9 MR. FLOURNOY: Timing me. (Laughter) Good
10 afternoon. My name's Peter Flournoy. I represent harvesters
11 on the West Coast, primarily albacore fishermen.

12 When I got here a couple of days ago, I thought it
13 was very clear that we had to have a NOAA FishWatch label that
14 we could we put on our fishery products. Now I'm a little
15 more confused, because I heard from John Connolly that you
16 really want to be careful if you ask the government to start
17 inspecting you. And then I heard from Bill Fox that,
18 actually, Magnuson only scores 52 percent on their criteria,
19 i.e., MSG criteria. And, really, what MSC is, is an eco-
20 label. I always thought it was supposed to focus on
21 sustainability. So, I think what I'm really in favor of is
22 that as a harvester representative of 400 fishermen who've
23 paid tens of thousands of dollars to have our fisheries
24 certified and then once the entire fishery is certified

1 there's no economic advantage whatsoever because everything's
2 certified so it cost us a lot of money it's based on exactly
3 what NOAA and NMFS and other international organizations have
4 done there's no value added brought by the certifier, and yet
5 they charge us tens of thousands of dollars, and that's really
6 got to change.

7 Secondly, they force us to take positions, and they
8 keep moving the goal posts. They force us to take positions
9 that even the E.U. and the United States haven't been able to
10 attain in RFMOs. We're supposed to advocate for fishery
11 harvest control rules. We're supposed to get the RFMOs to
12 agree to biological reference points.

13 We're an organization of 400 albacore fishermen and
14 their supporters. If the U.S. can't get it done and if the
15 E.U. can't get it done, how are we supposed to get it done?
16 And yet that's a requirement of our certification. And that's
17 really bad.

18 And the last thing I'd like to say is we catch fish
19 so people can eat them, and I was a little concerned because
20 I'm not sure how you can grade a fishery for animal welfare if
21 you eat the animal. I don't know how that quite works.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. TRUMBLE: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name
24 is Bob Trumble from MRAG Americas. We're a consulting

1 company, fishery consulting company, in St. Pete, Florida, and
2 I would like to support Kerry and Ray's position that NOAA
3 shouldn't go into the eco-label business. But I have an
4 alternative that I think would allow NOAA to help for folks
5 who want to move into certification of any of the programs
6 that are out there for anybody to use.

7 All four of our presenters indicated the importance
8 of NOAA data to certifications done at U.S. Fisheries. One of
9 the issues that many certifiers face is that sometimes the
10 data the information in fishery management plans, in safe
11 documents, in stock assessment reports are not well laid out
12 for people to use in these certification reports. So, if NOAA
13 because they're going to write these report anyway, could
14 orient them in a way to make the information more useful and
15 usable, easier to incorporate into the certification reports,
16 it would make the certification process easier and less
17 expensive and therefore provide a benefit to the fisheries
18 that want to incorporate this. It would not require NMFS, in
19 effect, nor would not favor any particular fishery, favor any
20 particular certification program, but would provide a major
21 benefit to all the certification programs, all the fisheries
22 that want to get certified, by making the fishery information
23 more accessible.

1 So, we suggest that NOAA should look at a
2 standardized reporting program for these key documents. That
3 would not only make things easier for the fisheries and the
4 certifiers but probably would make it easier for NOAA
5 internally to find information that they would need for their
6 own purposes within these very diverse kinds of documents.
7 So, with that, I'd like to just encourage to think about the
8 ways that you can support these certification programs without
9 actually having to support them individually.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. NARDI: Last but not least.

12 MR. KELLY: Yes, thank you. Good afternoon. Bill
13 Kelly. I'm the executive director of Florida Keys Commercial
14 Fishermen headquartered in Marathon, Florida.

15 We would endorse a certification program by NOAA,
16 and what we'd like to see is a national branding. I mean,
17 there are a number of institutions that already do this, or
18 organizations, but we believe that a national branding would
19 be much more important from a worldwide perspective similar to
20 a USDA Department of Agriculture endorsement on other
21 products that are grown or harvested here in the United
22 States. We'd like to see it independent of any cooperative
23 programs or other industries that may have sustainability
24 programs, because it eliminates any chances of tainting the

1 process or showing partiality because of funding partners or
2 other political or environmental agendas.

3 The other thing is that in addition to that
4 certification program, we'd also like to stress that it is
5 harvested to the most stringent of health controls under HACCP
6 controls and that our law enforcement capabilities, the chain
7 of custodial demand as it goes through the system, are
8 controlled from the actual catching of the fish all the way
9 through to its retail distribution to seafood consumers.

10 So, thank you very much.

11 MR. RIZZARDI: George?

12 MR. NARDI: Thank you, Keith, and thank you for
13 those comments. Let's see, it's we have some time. I'd like
14 to open it up to the committee for questions/comments of the
15 panelists.

16 MR. RIZZARDI: What would you think of taking a
17 break at this point?

18 MR. NARDI: Well, let me ask. I'd love to do that,
19 but let me ask, are the panelists going to be around?

20 MR. RIZZARDI: Is somebody leaving soon on the
21 panel?

22 MR. NARDI: Oh, yeah, somebody was leaving at four.

23 SPEAKER: I'm here.

1 MR. NARDI: It seems like the first thing we should
2 do is questions of the panelists who may have to leave us.

3 MS. METCALF: And, Mr. Chair, if there's an
4 opportunity to perhaps respond to some of the comments, that
5 would be appreciated.

6 MR. NARDI: Okay. So, Keith, I didn't hear you.
7 So, we're going to we'll wait for the break then. Okay. So,
8 if you'll bear with us then.

9 John?

10 MR. CORBIN: Molly of the BAP's certified farms.
11 How many are in the United States? How many? And what are
12 the species?

13 MS. METCALF: Catfish let me turn on my mic. We
14 have very few. There's a catfish farm, and we do have some
15 salmon, and a steelhead farm just came on board, but we have
16 very little at this time. And to be I mean, I'm not even
17 sure if I'm missing anyone at this point, but very few. When
18 you look at the amount of aquaculture that comes from other
19 places when you look at what's consumed that is U.S. product,
20 less than 5 percent of U.S.-produced seafood is aquaculture
21 product, so.

22 MR. NARDI: Pam?

23 MS. YOCHER: I also have a question for Molly. I
24 wondered where the USDA process that certifies hatcheries in

1 the United States, or registers hatcheries, where or if that
2 factors into your evaluation. So, in other words, if a
3 hatchery is annually inspected by USDA and has received that
4 certification, which has implications for international trade
5 and interstate commerce and so on, do you get to check that
6 off as a box and then perhaps not that's enough to certify a
7 certain list of things that are evaluated? Or is that taken
8 into consideration at all?

9 MS. METCALF: I actually am not sure at all on that.
10 I couldn't even begin to answer that. I can tell you that I
11 could grab your information and respond later. Unfortunately,
12 I don't have the details of the hatchery standard itself, but
13 our standards do look at a variety of different things. It's
14 possible that it wouldn't necessarily be something you could
15 just check off, but if you're following certain guidelines
16 that are environmentally, socially, food safety-specific it
17 may be an easier transition for you if you're already following
18 certain regs. But I can't speak specific to that at this
19 time.

20 MR. NARDI: David?

21 MR. WALLACE: Yeah, Molly, do you have a program for
22 chain of custody. You know, I didn't hear that and I couldn't
23 read the board, so it was hard for me to follow that. And how
24 do you have that set up if it's set up here?

1 Thank you.

2 MS. METCALF: We do have a chain of custody
3 requirement. We had an option of it electronically through
4 trace register, but we also just accept traditional chain of
5 custody with lots of paperwork. So, we do have that.

6 MR. NARDI: Paul?

7 MR. CLAMPITT: Yeah. Thanks, George. Ms. Coughlin,
8 you mentioned a comment about basically if NOAA was going to
9 give a certification you'd have the manager certifying itself,
10 and that was kind of like the if I got your point, it was
11 like the fox watching the henhouse, and it might not be
12 accepted worldwide. Was that your point that you were trying
13 to make?

14 MS. COUGHLIN: Yeah, I think you can whatever
15 analogy, but basically, yes, the FAO guidelines, which are
16 accepted worldwide, indicate it has to be third party, which
17 is truly independent from the fishery, from the management of
18 the fishery. So, that is a very important point, that as
19 fishery managers of the fishery being assessed, it would not
20 be third party if NOAA conducted that.

21 MS. MORRIS: Well, I wanted to give Kerry a chance
22 to respond to the critical comments about MSC, and so now is
23 the right time to do that.

1 MR. NARDI: I wanted to get questions first. Molly,
2 I do have just a question as well. One of the driving forces
3 behind this that was echoed by the committee in earlier
4 meetings and by a couple of the people there was about the
5 cost of the program, and I'm going to ask you if you can give
6 us how you determine the costs and sort of the typical ranges
7 from min to max you might see. You had mentioned, Kerry,
8 there's no \$2 million program. But is there a \$20,000 program
9 or a \$500,000 program? I would just like, for the committee's
10 sake, to get because part of our deliberation and concern is
11 cost of participation. If, maybe very briefly, you can give
12 us a feel for how that's determined and what's a range out
13 there of your clients.

14 MS. METCALF: Sure. Regardless of who runs this
15 standard-setting program if it involves the independent third-
16 party certification companies. That's where those fees are
17 set and established. MSC does not have any engagement in that
18 fee setting at all. And the certifiers there's one in the
19 room with us they don't like us to talk about fees, because
20 that's something they negotiate with their clients. But it's
21 a fair question what kind money are you talking about and
22 you were getting it right, I think, on the lower end of the
23 range, you know, \$20,000 if it were a small, simple fishery.
24 It's all just time and expense to do the site visit, do the

1 reports, you know, to do the work. Upper end, it's nowhere
2 near \$500,000. I haven't seen any fishery up around there. I
3 mean, maybe some that changed certifiers for some reason and
4 then, you know, they delayed and then you know, it might
5 start to build, but even a large, complex fishery should be
6 under \$200,000. And generally that's you know, if you spread
7 that across per pound, it ends up being less than a lot of
8 other types of fees that are assessed on fisheries.

9 MR. NARDI: And just a quick follow-up. In
10 selecting the certifier or the auditing body is that your
11 choice or is the client given a choice of one or two or

12 MS. COUGHLIN: The client is given a choice of any
13 credited certifier. Certifiers are accredited by an
14 organization called the Accreditation Services International.
15 That's the organization that oversees and credits the
16 certifiers. To certify to the MSC standard, we provide every
17 client with a full list of those, we encourage that they speak
18 to at least two or three to get a competitive bid and choose
19 who they want to work with.

20 MR. RIZZARDI: Kerry, is there an annual fee as
21 well?

22 MS. COUGHLIN: There is not an annual fee for a
23 fishery to be engaged. Their annual audits, conducted as part
24 of the certification a certificate is good for five years in

1 order to maintain that, you do have to do an annual audit as a
2 fishery. And then there are no but there are no none of
3 that comes to MSC, and there are no commercial fees or
4 royalties or any of that don't go to the fishery necessarily,
5 unless they're applying the label commercially in the market
6 themselves.

7 MR. RIZZARDI: So, the rumors I've heard about a
8 percentage fee per year are incorrect?

9 MS. COUGHLIN: Yeah. As I say, the only royalty fee
10 that's applied is at the point that the logo the MSC logo is
11 placed on a consumer-facing product. So, it can be used
12 throughout the supply chain B2B. It's only where it's
13 applied, and at that point it's also determined who will pay
14 that (inaudible). MSC doesn't dictate that. As I mentioned,
15 with Alaska salmon, 80 percent of its Europeans are paying
16 that because they want it. But in some cases, a retailer
17 wanting it might push that cost back to the processor.

18 MR. NARDI: Molly, would

19 MS. METCALF: In terms of the numbers again, just to
20 echo what Kerry said in terms of the audit piece, those third
21 parties that handle that, their fees could be different with
22 every audit. Depends on the amount of days, the amount of
23 time it really takes, and the certification team for
24 (inaudible) certainly doesn't like to give the specific

1 information to the market side of things, but it can vary.
2 But it when we do the average, when we look at the process of
3 a company getting BAP certified and that could be any part of
4 the chain the average cost comes out to two-tenths of one
5 cent per pound to get BAP certified. Now, that is the bare
6 bones if on day one an entity can get certified on the first
7 go-around. But, you know, there's typically some kind of
8 investment that will come into play for a company in terms of
9 their business for improvement purposes and whatnot. You
10 know, not everyone passes the first go-around.

11 Is there anything else? I don't want to miss

12 MR. AMES: Yeah George. Thank you. This is a
13 question for Molly, and I hate to air my ignorance but in your
14 presentation you mentioned that aquaculture firms had to
15 comply with all local procedures and protocols. And I guess
16 my question is doesn't FAO have a set of protocols that they
17 would have to meet that would be perhaps excessive from some
18 local growing areas?

19 MS. METCALF: I would say probably yes. The ins and
20 outs of that specific, you know I'm not and I don't know if
21 I could really answer that question exactly for you, because
22 the laws in the various wherever it is in the world can be
23 different. For BAP that's just a minimum piece to really look

1 at for a company (inaudible), so. I know that doesn't really
2 answer the question. I'm not

3 MR. AMES: Yeah.

4 MS. METCALF: Yeah.

5 MR. AMES: My concern was aquaculturists in this
6 country have very rigorous protocols that they have to follow,
7 and I now there are areas that do not, there are countries
8 that do not. Thank you.

9 MR. NARDI: Columbus and then Julie.

10 MR. BROWN: Excuse my ignorance, too. And maybe,
11 Thor, maybe you can help. You know, since the preponderance
12 of seafood sold in a market in the U.S. is imported, I was
13 curious as to what level of scrutiny are these products
14 receiving for either food safety and/or sustainability as they
15 enter this country and enter the marketplace?

16 MR. LASSEN: That would depend on each individual
17 country, obviously. Food safety laws are and the
18 importation-based products and this is monitored by FDA, and I
19 know from a business-to-business perspective, people who are
20 buying and importing product in the United States have a
21 certain amount of liability themselves. Most of the product
22 brought in goes through HACCP procedures at least the
23 producers do. In terms of sustainability, a product much of
24 that's driven by the customer and whoever's importing it,

1 because people that import seafood turn around and will sell
2 it to someone else in the United States. And more and more,
3 the question about sustainability is raised. So, every nation
4 has a different program that deals with sustainability and
5 whether (inaudible) might understandably think Iceland, Norway
6 for example. Some of them are working with GAA, some with
7 MSC. Some have their own programs that they've developed,
8 like Iceland has, so it varies from country to country.

9 What I'm doing is not really at this point looking
10 at any structures and systems outside the United States. But
11 I can tell you that there are countries and groups from other
12 nations that are interested in the approach that we're the
13 exercise that we're undertaking by looking at the total
14 management system.

15 MS. METCALF: And just to add to that, you know,
16 obviously, we're a global entity, so we are certifying all
17 over the world. But what is very important is where the
18 product is going to end up. So, you know, if someone's
19 producing a certain way and it doesn't fall in line with
20 guidelines that, say, the U.S. has here, for our consumers
21 that product won't make that's not going to come all the way
22 through the chain. So, we based our standards on like I
23 said, there's the basis of the local regs that are in place.
24 Obviously, the companies have to comply with those, but then

1 we do go above and beyond to make sure that if product is
2 coming through to the U.S., it's coming in and they're
3 following all the guidelines that exist for product that comes
4 here if that makes

5 MR. BROWN: I ask this question, because so often
6 you hear on the news or you sort of get the slant that we're
7 getting a lot of product that's coming in from various places
8 that are inferior. There are concerns about the safety of the
9 foods, and so I'm just wondering, you know, is this a real
10 problem? And if it is, is this going to help solve it on the
11 other side of the equation also?

12 MS. METCALF: For the GAA and the BAP program, we
13 think you know, food safety is part of what we do, but
14 obviously the environmental and social piece is really
15 important to us, and it's not I think the seafood industry in
16 general believes that there are probably a few bad apples that
17 spoil the bunch. There is far more good than actually goes on
18 in the industry that we are really aware of. And I think as
19 an industry, a seafood industry, you have to be better about
20 communicating that to people. So, you know, I've been in
21 seafood for 11 years, and I often get question from family and
22 friends about should I be concerned about what's coming from
23 other places. And I think entities, whether it's MSC, Global
24 Cap, BAP, we're really concerned about making sure that the

1 products certainly that we are certifying are what they need
2 to be for everyone.

3 MR. LASSEN: I would just add that this really is
4 also a question maybe that someone in the NOAA seafood
5 inspection office could answer maybe better than I, but I do
6 know that they do look at overseas production in compliance
7 with HACCP procedures. There are evaluations that go on for
8 food safety and other issues. So, I'll let someone else
9 answer that.

10 MR. NARDI: If I could actually thank you, Tim, but
11 I actually want to just keep us on track, and we're going to
12 come back to it, because now we're venturing into imports.
13 The discussion here is about domestic production sales inside
14 the U.S. and exporting, not bringing fish in. I apologize,
15 but I want to keep us on track, and I've got Tim cued up for
16 another question here anyway. But, first, Julie. And I'll
17 get to you, Tim.

18 MS. BONNEY: And one of the things that I was trying
19 to sort out is that I've heard two references this week about
20 the amount of seafood that comes out of Alaska was 128 percent
21 of the nation's production. And then you suggested that 58
22 percent of the U.S. fisheries are MSC certified. And knowing
23 the fisheries that I'm involved in, in Alaska, I think every
24 major fishery in Alaska, has got an MSC certification. So,

1 does that suggest that only 2 percent of the rest of the
2 nation has MSC certification? Because when you kind of listen
3 to who's advocating for what kind of an approach here, it
4 seems like maybe there are the haves and the have-nots, so to
5 speak, in terms of some have capital access and the ability to
6 go through the MSC certification versus those that may be
7 smaller fisheries and aren't well enough organized to get
8 through the process. So, I guess I'm asking Kerry if she
9 could be a little more definitive about what the 58 percent
10 really represents in terms of regional MSC certification
11 across the U.S.

12 MS. COUGHLIN: One, I could have the specific
13 figures right in front of me, but there are fisheries
14 throughout the United States that are certified, certainly
15 several in Oregon, a Gulf fishery, a number of them in New
16 England, and I'd be happy to provide that data for you so you
17 can have a better sense of how that's spread if you want to
18 take a look at fisheries in the region and where that spread
19 is.

20 MR. NARDI: I just at our previous meeting when we
21 were discussing this subject, one of our workgroup
22 deliberations and questions back to the NOAA team on the
23 working group was the issue that was brought up by both Molly
24 and Kerry about first-party and third-party review and

1 certification. And that was a concern with the team, and we
2 used as a reference point NOAA's seafood inspection program
3 and asked them to come back go us if that was considered
4 third-party verification or certification, and correct my
5 terminology, please.

6 But, Tim, could you explain that again to me or
7 remind me what the conclusion was?

8 MR. HANSEN: Now you're taxing my meager memory, but
9 as I recall, a third-party audit is someone, as Kerry points
10 out, that's independent of the process or the organization
11 that's being audited. And in the case that we laid out the
12 last MAFAC meeting in that group, seafood inspection has
13 nothing to do with fisheries management. We don't report
14 anywhere in that chain. We report to the Deputy Assistant
15 Administrator for Operations, and the fisheries management
16 folks and the science folks report to other deputies. And
17 given normal audit principles, that would make us an
18 independent third party. And although we're within the
19 organization, indeed these things go on all the time in
20 industry, and I believe that conforms with most accepted audit
21 principles.

22 MR. NARDI: Any other questions from MAFAC before
23 I'd like to have the panel, if they so choose, respond to some
24 of the questions or concerns?

1 Patty?

2 MS. DOERR: Kerry, one of the members of the public
3 mentioned that the Magnuson-Stevens Act management only
4 account for would only score about 52 percent I guess of your
5 scorecard the MSC scorecard. Can you respond to that
6 specifically? How much does management factor into your
7 scoring in your certification process?

8 MS. COUGHLIN: That reference was not about MSA
9 under the MSC standard per se. That was WWF. They have
10 developed criteria for what makes a credible standard or
11 certification program, and that's what I believe Bill Fox was
12 referring to when he said running the Magnuson-Stevens Act
13 through that, it would score only about 52 percent on their
14 benchmarking criteria for credible programs where the MSC is
15 around 90some percent. But that was not how MSA would score
16 against an MSC standard.

17 MR. NARDI: I think, Kerry, you wanted to maybe make
18 some comments or respond, as well as anyone else, and I'll let
19 you lead off.

20 MS. COUGHLIN: Thanks, Bill. I did want to make a
21 few points just in general but some things that came up and
22 some of the problems that I hear.

23 I think some of the problems that I heard and some
24 of the comments from the public I'll concur with some of

1 them. But I think it's inherent in a certification program.
2 So, some of what you heard as issues or problems might
3 actually just automatically be inherited by the agency if you
4 decided to take this on.

5 But I think also what I was hearing are some issues
6 around the value of this. "Dogfish" came up, for example.
7 Some of the value of the MSC certification, I think, is
8 probably somewhat hidden, because it's not something that we
9 really talk a lot about, and that's what happens once you
10 become a certified fishery and once you're an MSC certified
11 fishery and a partner. We are very vigorous about working
12 with those fisheries in the market and making market
13 connections for fisheries. We're very visible about being a
14 defense when those fisheries come under attack. And that
15 isn't a passive activity. And an example is dogfish. U.S.
16 dogfish's main market is Germany, and the German retailers
17 were cutting them off over concerns. MSC stepped in, and we
18 very proactively worked with our German office and at the
19 seafood show in Brussels pulled together a meeting with
20 representatives from the fishery and representatives from the
21 retailer and walked away with next steps to try to change the
22 course the German retailers were taking and wanting to delist
23 dogfish and to keep that market channel open to them.

1 When fisheries come under attack in the United
2 States, we will step in, we'll do fact sheets, we'll
3 distribute them to all of the retailers to give them the
4 confidence level that, regardless of what they may be hearing,
5 they hear the facts about this fishery, why it's sustainable
6 and why you can continue to keep that on the shelf. And they
7 like that, and they can use that with their customers or their
8 own executives who question things.

9 We do that with media. When Greenpeace put out a
10 press release saying the world's largest fishery is
11 collapsing, I spoke with Washington Post, New York Times and
12 the list goes on to proactively give them information and
13 defend that and keep those stories out of those publications.
14 And so there's a lot of that kind of work that goes on.

15 The ranking programs. We talk about it's difficult
16 for a fishery when they get delisted by one of the color code
17 systems, and MSC is very active with those organizations and
18 the Conservation Coalition for Sustainable Seafood; and we
19 work very actively, where a fishery is MSC certified, to try
20 to change if there's a lower ranking for some reason under
21 their standard to work with them and bring that back, and
22 we're making a lot of progress there.

1 So, those things don't just happen by accident.
2 These are things that have to be part of the value-add, I
3 think, of a certification program.

4 I think those are some of the key point I wanted to
5 make, and some of these other countries I'll point out
6 Iceland and some others that are trying this are also their
7 fisheries are also coming forward for MSC certification. So,
8 we're not seeing a replacement necessarily for that. The
9 fisheries are still seeing the value of engaging with MSC.

10 Another point I wanted to make was just on the
11 aquaculture. There's a tie not only with chain of custody
12 around aquaculture, but of course in the aquaculture world as
13 organizations like GAA, ASC step in, one of the main elements
14 in determining the sustainability of an aquaculture operation
15 is its feed fish. So, very often that's wild capture feed
16 fish, and they're looking for certification primarily of the
17 MSC but it could be open to anyone. They want credible
18 sustainability certification of the wild capture feed fish
19 that goes into that. So, that's an important tie.

20 But one sort of final point I wanted to make before
21 I relinquish is, you know, it's back to, I think, NOAA's rule
22 and NOAA's reputation, and I think if other governments around
23 the world were to emulate U.S. management systems and the
24 level of U.S. management and other governments were to do

1 that, I think that would just be a tremendous thing. And I
2 think that is happening and NOAA is a model. If NOAA develops
3 a seafood certification label and all the other government in
4 other countries emulate that action, I think then you're going
5 to have a big problem, especially when you're looking at
6 credibility of imports and what do you rely on. It's sort of
7 another can of worms and something to think about.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. NARDI: Thank you, Kerry. Thor?

10 MR. LASSEN: Just to follow up something that Bob
11 Trumble said, and I can say that through our experience and
12 our initial phase of our investigation, we do see some
13 benefits coming out of the process just in terms of organizing
14 documents, making them more readily available, putting them
15 into place that I think will be a cost savings for those that
16 do choose some other path forward. Whether it's a fisher that
17 goes through MSC or Global Trust, I think it is a benefit, and
18 it's one of the things I've found, that maybe Bob has found,
19 that sometimes it's difficult to cull the pieces together, and
20 that in itself will provide cost savings and publicly
21 demonstrate actually the viability of the fishery. So, they
22 know internally that they're doing the right thing, and they
23 believe it, but it's another thing merely to document it and

1 show it, and so that's something that we're experiencing as a
2 positive outcome of the process.

3 MR. NARDI: Molly, anything?

4 MS. METCALF: I think there was one comment on
5 animal welfare, which we do reference in our standard and look
6 at, and that comes down to I think that probably came about
7 through the NGO side of things where they, you know, are you
8 treating the fish nicely, and you have to make sure you do
9 that because of you know. So, in terms of but it goes
10 beyond that. We obviously do a lot for approved there's
11 approved drug use as part of the standard. You know, there
12 has to be a licensed veterinarian. There are plenty of
13 guidelines that come into play. But it's the theory that if
14 you have a sick child, you will give them medicine to make
15 them better and you won't send them to school to get all the
16 other kids sick. So, in the farming community, when you're
17 looking at farming seafood, we think it's important to
18 address, you know, disease. There's disease management that
19 comes into play, and that falls under the animal welfare
20 piece. So, that's just a comment to that.

21 MR. NARDI: Thank you. Last but not least, Laurel?

22 MS. BRYANT: Thanks, George. Let me see, final
23 thoughts. I guess what I'd like to say is that I think this
24 issue has matured. I'm pleased to see all this support for

1 U.S. fisheries, for NOAA Fisheries. I think this is a timely
2 discussion and I think everybody's passion. I want to
3 acknowledge everything from Ray to Kerry to all those who have
4 really put sustainable seafood and certification and
5 transparency on the global map. And I think this is an
6 opportunity to work together. If I can have MSC acknowledge
7 the authority and trust of NOAA Fisheries and U.S.-managed
8 fisheries, to me that's a big handshake that helps us move
9 forward with a lot of partners, along with Ray and Rick and
10 Lunds and the people around the table. So, I'm feeling very
11 positive about it, and I look forward to working the
12 committee.

13 Thanks, George.

14 MR. NARDI: Thanks, Laurel. I think I'll turn it
15 over to Keith, and maybe we can take our break.

16 MR. RIZZARDI: Absolutely. So, we are 15 minutes
17 schedule, but that's not too bad. So, we'll reconvene at
18 4:30.

19 (Recess)

20 MR. RIZZARDI: So, I know we all kind of weary. I
21 understand. We've all been going strong here for a while.

22 What I'm hoping, George, if this works for you I've
23 shuffled the schedule a little bit for tomorrow to add some
24 time for us to have the discussion. So, I'd still like to end

1 us on time today and just go for 20 minutes here until 5
2 o'clock. And we'll move some of the items in the morning.
3 So, we'll stay with the same agenda we had, but we're going to
4 start at 8:30 prompt, and then after an initial piece of
5 information with Mark and me, we will jump into further
6 discussion on sustainability certification in the morning.
7 But we do have 20 minutes, and I think first reactions from
8 people would be appropriate, but I'll leave that to you.

9 **Certification Working Group Deliberation**

10 **Work Plan Next Steps**

11 MR. NARDI: I think so, Keith. That's fine with me.
12 I know people have been here for the week, so it's been a long
13 day.

14 I think that we've had a lot of good input from
15 ourselves over the last few meetings and from the NOAA staff
16 and from the input from the Boston seafood show, from the
17 panelists.

18 And I think you also mentioned, Keith, that we also
19 have sent out a questionnaire to stakeholders, where we'll
20 continue to get information and reenforcing information in
21 regard to what the stakeholders are thinking about
22 certification.

23 So, I think at this point, because I'm also
24 cognizant of what's important to the constituents. You know,

1 MAFAC has a lot of other things on the agenda and plate to
2 deal with. So, I'd almost like to kind of push this kind of
3 forward so that at the next meeting we can really be beginning
4 to make some deliberations so we can advise and perform our
5 function to NOAA.

6 So, I guess at this point I'd ask the workgroup or
7 the committee that's here, as Keith said, to sort of discuss
8 their reactions.

9 And maybe, Keith, I could ask you start us off to
10 your input.

11 MR. RIZZARDI: Okay. Yeah, I've been spending quite
12 a lot of time thinking on this, and the first thing I want to
13 say is I think MSC serves an incredibly valuable purpose in
14 the marketplace, and I think what we're all wrestling with is
15 how well does it work in United States waters being managed by
16 the U.S. authorities? And I think part of why we're here is
17 because the fishing community and the stakeholders are getting
18 frustrated with the current process, and they look at what
19 happens in an Asian nation that doesn't have the standards
20 that we have and they compare it to what we have here, and
21 they say: How is this fair? It's costing us a fortune, and
22 it's the barrier to entry.

23 I think there have been a lot of good points made on
24 all sides, and I find myself breaking up the issue into

1 pieces, and I think it's important as we move forward that we
2 tread softly for starters. I think we have to realize the
3 limits that NOAA is facing right now, the financial
4 limitations that it faces. And as they get into this process
5 I think you heard clearly from some of the stakeholders, you
6 know, be careful about getting into a logo; be careful about
7 how far you dive into the inspection process; be careful about
8 the cost. So, I think we need to think about what can NOAA do
9 and what can't NOAA do?

10 So, when I start thinking about what NOAA can do,
11 clearly NOAA can make a statement as to whether or not a
12 fishery is living up to the 10 national standards. Clearly,
13 they are enforcing and implementing the Endangered Species Act
14 and the Marine Mammal Protection Act and seafood safety. We
15 have FishWatch already in place. I mean, those are all things
16 that NOAA can do that get us really close to some form of
17 something. I don't know if it's certification. I don't know
18 if it's branding. I'm not sure where we want to draw that
19 line. But there are clearly things that NOAA can do.

20 Then there are some things where I see that NOAA
21 needs a little bit of help. Some of them are sort of simple,
22 like NOAA is going to need some help on the aquaculture side
23 of the equation with making a statement as to what the
24 effluent looks like, because that gets into Clean Water Act

1 implementation, and somebody, either EPA or the permittee, is
2 going to be saying they're in compliance or they're not in
3 compliance with the requirements that are applicable.

4 NOAA will also need help on things like state
5 waters, tribal waters, HMS, international waters; and in those
6 areas it gets really complicated and really tricky. So, I go
7 back to my point about what can you do? What can't you do?

8 And the last thing that strikes me in all of this is
9 the Agricultural Marketing Act is out there, and it says that
10 we're supposed to be talking about USA fish, and there's
11 supposed to be a way of putting out there and promoting USA
12 wild fish and USA farmed fish. So, there's already a piece of
13 a mechanism out there. And I find myself chewing on all those
14 different pieces of the puzzle and thinking, well, maybe
15 there's a way that we can come up with a baseline and NOAA can
16 have something out there that serves the community, sort of a
17 brand of USA seafood; and if it's USA seafood, you know it
18 lives up to these standards and we can promote it as such on
19 FishWatch. And maybe there's still, then, space for groups
20 like MSC and whatever other certifications are out there, and
21 some groups are going to want to appeal to certifications
22 anyway. Some groups are going to say, well, we want to be
23 considered in animal welfare, and they're going to want some
24 third party verifier.

1 So, I think there are a lot of issues that we need
2 to talk our way through, and I don't think this is going to
3 happen overnight. But my instinct is that there is some place
4 for NOAA to develop some sort of program, and I just think
5 it's important for us to be cautious in far we reach and how
6 far we push.

7 So, those are my initial thoughts.

8 MR. NARDI: Thanks, Keith. Additional comments?
9 Dave?

10 MR. WALLACE: When I joined MAFAC five years ago,
11 one of the things that I thought NOAA could do was to move the
12 fisheries management and sustainability idea to the consumer
13 or to the public to the consumer because under the fisheries
14 management plans and for all those fish raised that aren't
15 overfished, overfishing isn't occurring, and then they have a
16 stable and sustainable trajectory. And we may have to
17 redefine that just slightly, but that's a policy decision of
18 our policy issues. We don't need congressional legislation to
19 do that. Then we should be able to say, under FishWatch or
20 anything else, this particular fishery is sustainable. It
21 falls under the most stringent national laws, which are the
22 most stringent international regulations in the world, and why
23 shouldn't the National Fishery Service and the federal
24 government certify sustainable fisheries just by saying under

1 all the criteria that we have and if you go back and relate
2 it to all the sustainable portions of FAO, because I've heard
3 that extensively we exceed all those criteria. So, would we
4 not do it?

5 Now, I can tell you that if we're going to talk
6 about blue fin tuna now, we fulfill our quota, our
7 international under ICCAT, within the United States but lots
8 of other countries in the world don't, and it probably is not
9 sustainable, and so some of those things and that would be
10 unfair to U.S. fishermen by saying because the members of
11 ICCAT don't necessarily play by the rules that we play by,
12 that we can't say that the Atlantic blue fin tuna is
13 sustainable, because it probably is not. It's pretty obvious
14 it is not. And so then we just have to be straightforward and
15 say because of the misbehavior of other people, we can't
16 certify this particular fishery. But all the domestic
17 fisheries, and even some of the trans-boundary fisheries with
18 Canada and, you know, I don't see why they aren't certifiable
19 from the beginning. And I heard from the person from Alaska
20 that, you know, we don't know what we're getting into. If the
21 United States government can't do it, then how can, you know,
22 an independent organizations do it? And if independent
23 organizations can do it, then surely if there's a
24 determination, the U.S. government can do it.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. NARDI: Julie?

3 MS. MORRIS: Thank you George. I was most
4 supportive of Bob Trumble's suggestion to us that the proper
5 role for NOAA in all this is to get our information about the
6 status of fisheries posted out and communicated and some of
7 the kinds of certification criteria that some of these private
8 groups are looking for that's buried in some of our documents,
9 making that all a bit more accessible. But I'm not convinced
10 that a government program coming in late to the whole
11 certification private sector thing that's going on is really
12 the right role for NOAA at this point in time. I think we're
13 coming in late. I think that it's really I was convinced by
14 somebody's comment that it's the buyers who are requiring
15 this, and it's a kind of producer-to-buyer thing. I think
16 there's a scale or a strata of the fishery where if you want
17 to export, if you want to sell to WalMart, you're going to
18 need some kind of defensible certification program, and I'm
19 not convinced that's the role of NOAA. I think providing good
20 quality data where we have it and having that out there for
21 people to use is the proper role for us.

22 And, Keith, to your comment that we could easily say
23 whether a fishery meets the 10 national standards, I don't
24 think that's true, and I don't think we really know what OY

1 is. We could say that fisheries are managing for OY, but
2 there's been a lot of discussion this week about what does OY
3 really represent socially and economically. I don't think we
4 really know whether fisheries are doing the best by fishing
5 communities yet. I think those parts of the national
6 standards are articulated as goals, but we haven't really come
7 up with the assessment mechanisms to figure out how successful
8 we're being in our managed fisheries in those areas. So, I
9 don't think it's that straightforward.

10 MR. RIZZARDI: Julie Bonney in the corner.

11 MR. NARDI: Okay, Julie and then is that Columbus?

12 MR. RIZZARDI: Ted.

13 MR. NARDI: Ted. Okay, go ahead.

14 MS. BONNEY: Thanks

15 MR. AMES: Thanks, George. I kind of like Keith's
16 suggestion. I think the thing we can certify is that people
17 are functioning under the rules and regulations that if they
18 sell their fish in the U.S., they're caught in U.S. waters,
19 and they have HACCP, et cetera, no, you can't guarantee that
20 MSY is attained or being attained, but you can certify that
21 the fishery is being managed. And there is a suite of them
22 that are improving because of measures taken by the U.S. and
23 NOAA. So, I think there's room to tease out a certification
24 that validates what's being done here, even though we may not

1 be able to sort out exactly frankly, sustainability is kind
2 of a mushy term, and until we really solidify that, I don't
3 know how far you could go there anyway. But there are things
4 we can do.

5 MS. BONNEY: So, I guess I would like to think about
6 rebranding the conversation, because I don't really think
7 we're looking for a certification. I think we're looking for
8 the U.S. government to stand up for the fisheries that they
9 manage and say they're doing a job managing the fishery. So,
10 what I guess I envision is, one, to continue with FishWatch
11 and, two, to have some kind of a letter approach where you
12 could go and get a letter from the Secretary of Commerce that
13 the fishery is being managed under the Magnuson-Stevenson Act,
14 and then those producers could take that and give that to the
15 buyers. It would be simple, straightforward. And the goal is
16 to keep the cost low.

17 The other thing that we potentially could do is have
18 kind of the USDA brand, which says it's been produced, you
19 know, at a U.S. fishery and it's under the U.S. construct, and
20 so we're good to go. We're not into the eco-label construct
21 for MSC, and so if people within the industry want to go to
22 that level because they have market needs in Europe or
23 wherever, then they can still go and get certified by an
24 outside third-party certifier. So, we're not trying to

1 replace that business model. We're trying to just stand by
2 the fisheries that we're managing in the U.S. So, I think that
3 would do well in just the U.S. market.

4 I don't know how to address the aquaculture question
5 in that, and so that might be something that would have to be
6 you know, because of the Magnuson Act in aquaculture, I don't
7 know that they're part and parcel.

8 Oh, I lost my thought, last spot. So, anyway, I
9 think we should think about something simple and just
10 something inexpensive, and if we start down the process, I
11 think FishWatch has been a big success. It's been in the
12 water for 14 months, and so if we started down this road,
13 maybe two years from now we'll decide that we need to go to
14 another leg of the path, but I think we could get there in
15 short order and not conflict with some of the other business
16 models.

17 MR. NARDI: Bob.

18 MR. RHEAULT: Yeah, I agree, and I think we've heard
19 from a lot of our buyer interviews that this is a B2B tool.
20 They don't want a mark that would go to the consumer level.
21 They don't need that. But they do see that this allows them
22 to fill a gap for certain producers that are unable to qualify
23 or unable to afford to qualify small producers. It does fill
24 a gap.

1 I wanted to address the comments that came up
2 earlier about NOAA's going to get attacked by the ENGOS, well,
3 the ENGOS already attack each other for not being green enough
4 for their various certification standards. So, then that's
5 just part of the landscape that we're working under.

6 We are going to have to be prepared to defend the
7 brand, as that stands, and say we are really doing a good job
8 in managing our fisheries, and there will be a cost associated
9 with that. But I think that it can be done cheaply and
10 simply, and from what I've heard from the vast majority of the
11 buyers that we interviewed, it seems to be something they're
12 willing to accept, and I think we should continue to explore
13 what it's going to cost. What it is, is getting more and more
14 defined, and that allows us to take the next step and do a
15 cost analysis, and I think we should continue to explore this.
16 I'm very encouraged by what I've heard.

17 MR. NARDI: And just as a follow-up, Bob, on Julie's
18 comment just a second ago, also with the FishWatch program,
19 maybe you have a letter but maybe also in this day and age it
20 could be simply another portal on the FishWatch website or
21 something where those producers, fisheries, farmers that
22 qualify, and then that's defined how you qualify then it's
23 listed there, and it's transparent and public for the buyers.

24 Keith, you had a go.

1 MR. RIZZARDI: Just hearing the conversation
2 reminded me, one of the themes that came out of interviews in
3 the Boston seafood show was certification, registration
4 number, letter, logo, website we don't care. What we really
5 want is the United States to stand by its brand. I mean, if I
6 could summarize the theme that I heard over and over, that was
7 it.

8 There was some disagreement as to whether we'd
9 really like to see a logo or we wouldn't like to see a logo,
10 and that kind of depended if you were a big buyer or a small
11 buyer. But, universally, everybody said USAs are one of the
12 best managed fisheries in the world. What we want is a well-
13 managed fishery to stand up and say this product comes from a
14 well-managed fishery, and if you have some mechanism to give
15 us that, please help us get there.

16 MR. NARDI: Any other Michelle?

17 MS. LONGO EDER: One of the recurring themes we
18 heard this week was about budget and the potential for
19 continuing reductions and more than just sequestration. And
20 accompanying that theme was the issue that we're going to have
21 to make some tradeoffs nationally as we look at fisheries
22 management. And there were many priorities that were set
23 forth by all the different focus groups, some of which are
24 going to add significantly to budgets. And I think that that

1 issue as much as anybody I think probably here has a
2 commercial fishing vessel, (inaudible), and family, I am
3 enormously proud of what we do. I am enormously proud of how
4 NOAA manages our fisheries, and I try to tell our story to
5 everyone I see and feel very good about it. And I think that
6 one of the ways to go about it, to echo some of the comments,
7 is to make another, a greater investment in FishWatch, and I
8 was encouraged to hear Laurel talk about an app. I mean, I
9 think that as simple as that sounds, I think that that is how
10 many consumers can approach a fish market (inaudible) their
11 grocery store or whatever. They see a fish and they want to
12 check and look.

13 That sounds simple, but I think that that is a very
14 cost-effective way to communicate to the consumer currently
15 who really cares and wants to have that instant information
16 and feel good about what they buy. You know, is this fish
17 you know, do I feel good about buying this fish? And they
18 think that's an important thing.

19 One of the things I did want to comment on about
20 what Laurel said was that right now FishWatch and correct me
21 if I misunderstood this is not oriented to the consumer, that
22 it's directed toward more the buyer, in terms of information
23 and if I'm wrong let me know about that, but I think we really
24 want to continue with a vision of driving it to the consumer.

1 So, just a couple of other comments. I do, for
2 fairness and full disclosure, want to say that we participate
3 in the Oregon Dungeness Crab Fishery, the Oregon Pink Shrimp
4 Fishery, and also in the West Coast individual quota program,
5 "Fisheries for Sable Fish with Fixed Gear." But two of those
6 fisheries the trawl fishery is now undergoing either
7 participates in MSC certification or is being recertified or
8 is undergoing certification. So, in full and fair disclosure,
9 I want to say that, and I support that process.

10 But I also want to say it's because we need to get
11 those fish into markets in order to be able to compete
12 worldwide, and so those things are very important to us, and
13 so thank you.

14 MR. NARDI: You're welcome. I think it's a little
15 after five, and I think I'll turn it back to Keith and Mark,
16 if unless there's any other burning questions. Comments?

17 MR. RIZZARDI: Anybody want to get a last word in on
18 seafood sustainability or carry it over to tomorrow morning?

19 Okay, so for tomorrow, we are starting up at 8:30.
20 We are not here. We are at the hotel where most of us are
21 staying, the Marriott Courtyard? All right, so we have a room
22 there.

23 Mark will be opening up our discussion with the
24 traditional report on our previous outputs and the status.

1 We're going to talk about our upcoming meetings, which may be
2 virtual. We're going to talk about our summer subcommittees.
3 And I'm going to give a report out on my experience with the
4 Working Waterfront Symposium in Tacoma, which very much
5 relates to much of what we've been hearing in the Managing Our
6 Nation's Fisheries 3 conference, especially on working
7 waterfronts in sustainable communities. So, those issues will
8 run together. We'll try to get that done in half an hour,
9 from 8:30 to 9, and then we will resume the certification
10 discussion at 9 o'clock tomorrow.

11 And, Mark, do you have anything else to add? Okay.
12 Any other business? Yes.

13 MS. COUGHLIN: I was just going to say very quickly
14 again, thank you for having me, and I hope you found that
15 helpful. I'm going to be racing through that door, as soon as
16 you adjourn, to catch a flight, but myself or either of my
17 staff who are here are available on a continuing basis if you
18 would like more information or discussion.

19 MR. RIZZARDI: Your presentations were very
20 informative, and I'm sure we're going to be following up with
21 more questions from all of you.

22 Thank you so much, and this meeting is adjourned.

23 (Whereupon, at 5:06 p.m., the

24 PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I, Mark Mahoney, notary public in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell the truth under penalty of perjury; that said transcript is a true record of the testimony given by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was called; and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public, in and for the District of Columbia

My Commission Expires: March 14, 2014